

Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht

Official Organ of the German Section of the Modern Language
Association of the Central West and South

Volume XXXV

November, 1943

Number 7

HEINRICH HEINE AND THE EARLY VICTORIANS

SOL LIPTZIN

The City College, New York

Great literary personalities come to us not only bearing the gifts of their own works but also garlanded, swathed, and costumed by critical interpreters, translators, and biographers. The real human being becomes in time a formula, the once living individual a legend. Each age mirrors itself not alone in its symbolic contemporary figures but also in its re-interpretation of the significant figures of long ago. Each people reveals itself not merely in its own intellectual leaders, chosen or self-appointed, but also in its evaluation of the intellectual élite of its neighbors, friends, and foes.

Of all the nineteenth century German poets, Heinrich Heine was best known beyond the confines of his native land but nowhere abroad was his popularity more extensive or his influence more profound than among the English, whom he maligned and so tragically misunderstood. The English legend of Heine from its origin in pre-Victorian days to its present complex configuration is markedly different from the German legend and is worth relating because of the light it sheds both upon the English and upon this poet.

The earliest critics of Heine in the Eighteen-Twenties and Eighteen-Thirties did, it is true, follow in the wake of his German detractors, such as Wolfgang Menzel, and wrote of him as a blackguard and apostate, a Jacobine propagandist and modern Mephistopheles.¹ Carlyle best typified this approach. Recent critics, on the other hand, saw in Heine the bard of democracy, the prophet of global conflicts, the satirist of aristocratic privilege and of political and ecclesiastical tyranny. Havelock Ellis, Edward Dowden, H. W. Nevinson, Arthur Ransom, Michael Monahan ushered in this contemporary tradition, which was especially stressed in the nine full-length English biographies that appeared in the interval between the two World Wars.

It was among the mid-Victorians, however, that adoration of Heine reached its height. George Eliot and Matthew Arnold were the chief architects of his lasting English fame. Their efforts in his behalf, both in prose and in verse, are fairly well known. The present article limits

¹ Sol Liptzin: *Heinrich Heine, Blackguard and Apostate*, Publications of the Modern Language Association, March 1943, Vol. LXVIII, pp. 170-180.

itself to the pioneering labor of their predecessors. It aims to prove that the change from initial hostility to later enthusiasm took place not after the poet's death, as is generally assumed, but during his lifetime and that lesser known English interpreters in the two decades between 1837, when Victoria came to the throne, and 1856, when the poet met his end in Parisian exile, laid the firm foundation for the Heine-vogue which has endured undiminished until the present day.

The years after 1837 witnessed a constant increase of Heine's influence upon English thought and English letters. The vituperations heaped upon him by the pre-Victorian publicists, egged on by the *Quarterly Review* and the circle about Thomas Carlyle, continued to some extent up to the mid-century, but there was mingled with all the bitter reproaches about Heine's malign influence a definite admiration for his talent as a poet and his brilliance as a wit.

There were three distinct avenues through which Heine's influence made itself felt. In the first place, there were the English reviews and English translations, which increased in number and in depth of insight from year to year. In the second place, there were Englishmen, such as George Meredith and Julian Fane, who studied or travelled in Germany at a time when Heine's literary star was in the ascendancy and his songs were captivating the hearts of his countrymen. In the third place, there were Englishmen, such as Colonel John Mitchell and Richard Monckton Milnes, later known as Lord Houghton, who stayed in France and who came in contact with the exiled German poet and his circle of Parisian admirers.

To begin with the English Reviews, these devoted more space to Heine in the Eighteen-Forties than in the earlier decades and the tone of their comments was less hostile. Thus, the *Foreign Quarterly Review* of July 1845 wrote of the poet as "the seditious, profane, immoral, witty, genial, and graceful Heine."² It called him a true poet of the Epicurean school, even though he scandalized many persons by assuming the falsehood and meanness of kings, national sentiments, and respectable traditions. Beneath his laughter at everything that had a serious pomposity, it sensed a tenderness of feeling, which gave relief to his destructive humor.

The *Dublin University Magazine* in 1846 conferred on Heine the title of the Teutonic Voltaire. It reprinted his verses on *Barbarossa* as typical of his amusing satire on both of the extreme political parties of Germany, the Republicans and the Absolutists.³ A year earlier, this periodical had reviewed his poems at great length. It did not hide its horror at his poetic packages of poison, at his infamous tone which rivalled Machiavelli and Voltaire at their worst. But it did admire his all-embracing humor. It found his prose racy, sparkling, and far surpassing Goethe's in force, rapidity of thought, and transparent clearness of style. Though the curse of the sneerer was upon him, it saw him rising at times to

² *Foreign Quarterly Review*, July 1845, Vol. XXXV, p. 448.

³ *Dublin University Magazine*, 1846, Vol. XXVIII, p. 171.

supreme heights and giving sublime renderings to themes of devotion, of chivalrous heroism, or of bruised affection, themes that others, with purer intentions, only succeeded in making ridiculous. Because of the melancholy misdirection of his glorious faculties, he was more deserving of pity than condemnation. He must be regarded as the German Byron, since he possessed to the full Byron's faults and Byron's genius.⁴

Two articles in *Fraser's Magazine*, a leading organ of English opinion, illustrate the gradual ebbing of hostility towards Heine during the Eighteen-Forties. The earlier remarks on the poet appeared in April 1840.⁵ Heine was introduced as a German author who spent a life of exile in comical striving after French vivacity of style. Stress was put upon his hatred of England and everything English. Though his own works were prohibited in his native Prussia and though he had the reputation of a liberal, he yet sought the downfall and utter extinction of the English nation. He thereby joined hands with the most bigotted champions of absolutism against the people whose manners might be absurd from his viewpoint but who otherwise little deserved his enmity.

Two years later, however, *Fraser's* introduced Heine in more pompous terms as "the proscribed Heine, the banished Heine, the Heine whose satire has made kings repugn him, philosophers hate him, statesmen prosecute him, and the Romish Church excommunicate him."⁶ In December 1842, it printed the reminiscences of an English officer who knew him in Paris and who drew a vivid pen-portrait of him at the height of his productive career, when he enjoyed his rôle as the idol of Young Germany and the curse of Old Germany.

The anonymous author of the *Reminiscences of Men and Things* has been identified as Colonel John Mitchell, an accomplished linguist, diplomat, and traveller, the confidant and biographer of the Duke of Wellington. Mitchell's sketches of famous personalities abounded in intimate personal details. He wrote on Lafayette, Louis Philippe, Metternich, Thiers, Chateaubriand, Victor Hugo, and Guizot. His description of Heine was never reprinted and yet it contained many interesting observations of the poet's character and mannerisms. The following may serve as an illustration: "Look at the little man as he walks along the Paris Boulevards, with a sort of indescribable strut — indescribable, because not intended, and being a sort of demi-strut between strutting and walking. See how he talks to himself, smiles, as if pleased with some new conceit he has just imagined, or with some new notion he is about to forward to the *Augsburg Gazette*. But what a wonderful face he has! how full of animation, soul, mind! how, when he looks at you, he appears to read all your thoughts, and to weigh, adopt, or reject them! how he pounces down on any original idea which may escape the lips of some one in society with him; and how, after turning it over and over again, he returns it

⁴ Dublin University Review, 1845, Vol. XXVI, p. 283.

⁵ Fraser's Magazine, April 1840, Vol. XXI, pp. 446-448.

⁶ Fraser's Magazine, December 1842, Vol. XXVI, pp. 733-736.

to you either dissected, cut to atoms, and shown to contain nothing valuable; or else how it comes forth dressed up in fairy importance, and made to appear wonderful and sublime."

The first meeting between Heine and the Englishman took place in the reading room of Galignani at Paris, where Heine often went in order to look through the latest journals from the various European centers. Theodore Morawski, an exiled Polish patriot, introduced the two to each other. Heine's sardonic smile and penetrating glance were fixed upon the stranger, who described the encounter as follows: "The little man surveyed me, looked at my frame, my head, my arms, and then into my eyes. It was a survey which occupied some two or three minutes — most minute, certainly, but by no means agreeable. He did not rise from his chair, nor did he take off his hat, but smiled most satirically, and then recommenced turning over the leaves of the *Austrian Observer* and of the *Augsburg Gazette*. I had known all about him before that period; but I had not before been introduced to him. Morawski made a signal to walk in the garden, and Heine came rolling after us. His hands were in his pockets as if searching for coin; his shoulders were raised so high that his head seemed buried between them, his underlip had dropped most sardonically, and his smile indicated that he had something very wicked or very witty to utter — perhaps both." The conversation turned about politics, and especially English politics. Heine expressed many bitter aversions. He never laid aside his habit of critical observation and he was especially keen in discovering the ridiculous aspect of any situation. "Heine looks upon himself as he does upon all men — as actors, some playing farce, others comedy, and few tragedy; but all actors."

Apparently the Englishman was no less observant than the German, for his comments encompassed not only Heine, the poet, the dramatist, the sketcher of nature, the philosopher most akin to Zeno, but also Heine, the lover and the humanitarian. Concerning Heine's boundless affection for the fair sex, there was the following remark: "His imagination seems inexhaustible when he revels in the delight of talking or writing about them. But it is not their minds, but their hearts; not their intellects, but their passions; not their social and domestic, but their enthusiastic and ardent characteristics he admires; and hence when in his writings he describes women in their family spheres and moral circles of quiet home enjoyment, he dips his pen in gall, and satirizes them most unkindly." Concerning the more humane side of Heine's character, there was the following notation: "And yet Henri Heine is a kind, good-hearted man to the afflicted, the sorrowing, or the unfortunate. He has always a word of interest, a look of sympathy, a double-handed shake of the hand, for those who seem to need his love, or to ask for his bounty. But he has more than this. His purse is never his own where humanity has a claim upon it, and charity asks not in vain for his aid. But take care! do not be pathetic, do not round your phrase, or poetize your appeal, when you

ask him to assist some unhappy exile or some unfortunate being. For if you do, the ludicrousness of your having 'got up' the scene, 'simply to induce him to perform an act of humanity,' will rush across his mind; and he will laugh, not at you, and not at the misery of which you speak, but at the scene you are enacting. This is Henri Heine. On he writes, and on he labors, a real literary Hercules, and one third of Europe thinks him unrivalled."

The one third of Europe, mentioned in these reminiscences of 1842, included old and young, lords and commoners, Germans, Frenchmen, and not a few Englishmen. It was in this very year of 1842 that George Meredith attended school in Germany but none of the school authors were as dear to him as the proscribed Heine. After his sixteenth birthday he would quote the poems of Heine ten at a time and the simple lyrics of the *Book of Songs* filled his youthful heart with rapture."⁷ Throughout a long life he retained his interest in the German poet. He read him in the original and in translation. He also read various critical and biographical studies on Heine, including those by Matthew Arnold, William Stigand, and William Sharp. Almost half a century after his first acquaintance with Heine's works, he wrote to Sharp at the close of 1888: "Your Heine gave me pleasure. I think it competently done; and coming as a corrective of Stigand's work it brings the refreshment of the antidote. When I have the pleasure of seeing you, we will converse upon Heine. Too much of his — almost all of the Love poems — draw both tenderness and tragic emotion from a form of sensualism; much of his wit too was willful; a trick of the mind."⁸

Another young Englishman who in the Eighteen-Forties succumbed to the spell of Heine's poetry was Julian Fane, the son of Lord Burghersh. In 1844 at the age of seventeen, he was appointed attaché at Berlin, where his father served as the British Minister to Prussia. In this home, frequented by Alexander von Humboldt, Giacomo Meyerbeer, and Felix Mendelssohn, Heine must have been often a subject for conversation. The young attaché became his most ardent worshipper. When Fane entered Cambridge in 1847 and soon found himself the leader of a brilliant group of intellectuals known as the "Cambridge Apostles," he doubtless was influential in winning their affection for Heine. His unflagging enthusiasm also infected his friend and later biographer Robert Bulwer, Earl of Lytton, who is better known under the pseudonym of Owen Meredith and who afterwards wrote one of the finest English essays on Heine. Both Julian Fane and Robert Lytton were on the British diplomatic staff in Vienna during the early Eighteen-Fifties. It was then that they collaborated on a long poetic version of the Tannhäuser legend, which had recently been popularized on the Continent by Heine and Wagner. It was then also that Julian Fane occupied his leisure hours with translations from Heine.

⁷ R. E. Sencourt: *Life of George Meredith*, New York, 1929, p. 16.

⁸ Elizabeth A. Sharp: *William Sharp*, London, 1912, Vol. I, p. 229.

These were printed for private circulation in Vienna in 1854 and favorably reviewed by Lord Houghton in the *Edinburgh Review* of July 1856. Julian Fane also planned a critical biography of Heine. Though an early death prevented the completion of this biography, an insight into Fane's portrait of his hero can be obtained from an article which he contributed to the *Saturday Review* in November 1855.

The article was entitled: *Heinrich Heine, Poet and Humorist*. It presented the hero as the founder of a new school of German letters. It recommended the *Travel Sketches* not as a descriptive book of travels but as a picture of the times, as a mirror of the hopes and fears which agitated the minds of men, as an expression of the conflict of opinions, religious, moral, and political, which convulsed society, as a successful assault upon the strongholds of antiquated reactionary ideas, as a contemptuous satire upon the follies, unjustified expectations, and sullen lethargy of the Germans. "Into the province of Art the young Reformer entered with an audacity which astounded its sober and terrified guardians. Singing his wild 'Ca Ira,' he proceeded with revolutionary zeal to overturn the idols he there found enthroned. The romantic school, with its nasal twang, must depart; the maudlin worshipers of a canting sentimentalism must be thrust out; senseless forms, from which the spirit had long since fled, now get buried without any rites of sepulture; exact propriety and pompous gravity are dismissed with a laugh, and pedantry with all its sickly shapes must be banished from the national literature. Great was the dismay, and great also the indignation, produced by the feat of the adventurous writer. His countrymen divided at once into two hostile parties, one of which saw with alarm and shame the attack made upon all that it had been taught to consider venerable, while the other, gazing with rapture on the havoc that had been done, hailed its author as the chief of a happy revolution in the history of literature and art."⁹

Fane noted that this division of opinion yielded to general acclamation after the appearance of the *Book of Songs*, for here were lyrics with a freshness of diction and terseness of expression which would have done honor to Goethe. Fane even found a resemblance of Heine to the gentle Wordsworth in simplicity of style and in the selection and treatment of some subjects. In other qualities, however, he saw a far closer affinity of Heine to the fierce, fretful soul of Byron. Despite Heine's satirical invective, which respected neither things human nor divine, he was not misanthropic. His fiendish characteristics resulted from disappointed idealism. The tender imaginative poet, who, like Wordsworth, could clothe simple thoughts in a purity of language not unbecoming the lips of a saint, learned to scoff with the temerity of Voltaire, to ridicule with the savageness of Swift, and to rail with the spleen of Byron. When Heine's youthful faith collapsed, he lost his anchor in life. He ceased to be an earnest man or to retain any consistency in his approach to morals

⁹ Robert Lytton: *Julian Fane. A Memoir*, London, 1871, p. 93.

or politics. He did not know whether he should smile blandly or snarl bitterly at humanity. He was a most perplexing figure. "Indeed, the wanton insults which he heaped upon his countrymen, the unjustifiable personalities in which he has approached subjects the most sacred in the eyes of the vast majority of his fellow-beings, do give evidence of a certain moral turpitude in the man — out of which, however, as from a fetid soil, have grown those pure and perfect lilies of song with which he has adorned the literature of his native land. It is impossible not to condemn much that he has written; it is scarcely possible sufficiently to praise a great deal more; and while children and the purest of women love him for the simple beauty of his songs, many a man little given to the affectation of purism abominates him for the scurrilous ribaldry of his satires. If his countrymen perplex themselves in endeavoring to spell the enigma of his character, it is perhaps because they make the attempt upon very false principles. Surely it is a vain labor to seek for consistency in the thoughts and consecutives in the acts, of the greatest humorist of the age; and the metaphysician, who is only intent on discovering the *Grundidee*, or leading principle in a man's life, can scarcely hope to gauge the character of Heinrich Heine."¹⁰

Fane was too fond of Heine to end his essay on a note of disapproval. He rather sought to center final attention upon the martyr of Montmartre, the paralyzed, blind, and bedridden poet who was dying in an obscure Paris lodging and who amidst acutest torments still dreamed romantic dreams and still delighted mankind with his incomparable humor.

Fane's translations of fifty-seven poems by Heine are practically unknown. They were originally printed in 1854 in a limited edition for his friends. They were revised after this printing, partly as a result of Lord Houghton's criticisms, and would probably have been included in the biography of Heine planned by Fane but never completed. Robert Lytton incorporated these revised and improved versions in his book *Julian Fane. A Memoir*, which appeared in 1871, and these gems have been quietly reposing in this rare volume, while poorer translations have been read and sung by several generations of Englishmen and Americans. Fane was an excellent German scholar. Not a single subtlety of Heine's lyricism escaped him. Furthermore, Fane was a gifted musician and a composer of music. His translations, pleasant to the ear, would be a delight for singers. Finally, Fane never interposed his personality in his renderings. He never tried to improve upon Heine but sought to reproduce the original in idiomatic English. Because of his fine poetic taste and his facility of expression, he succeeded more often than any of his contemporaries.

Among the Early Victorians, only Richard Monckton Milnes, Lord Houghton, could boast of translations of equally fine worth. This older friend of Julian Fane, however, selected different poems and took greater liberties with the original. The interest of Milnes in Heine went back to

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 98.

the year 1840 and remained undiminished throughout the following decades. Like Julian Fane, he too treated the Tannhäuser legend, but his version is uninfluenced by Wagner and derives its inspiration mainly from Heine. Its very title, *The Goddess Venus in the Middle Ages*, is evidence of this influence. It appeared in 1844, four years after Milnes had made Heine's acquaintance in Paris. That both had a high opinion of each other can be deduced from articles on Heine written by Milnes in the *Edinburgh Review* of July 1856 and in the *Academy* of March 4, 1876, as well as from a letter written by Heine to Lady Duff-Gordon not long before his death. This Lady had introduced the young Englishman to the poet and, as Heine on his mattress-grave recalled the pleasant impressions produced by his English visitors, he regretted his earlier vitriolic comments on England: "I do not know what possessed me to dislike the English, and to be so spiteful towards them, but it really was only petulance. I never hated them; indeed, I never knew them. I was only once in England, but knew no one, and found London very dreary, and the people in the streets odious. But England has revenged herself well; she has sent me most excellent friends — thyself and Milnes — that good Milnes — and others."¹¹

The first article of Milnes on Heine appeared only a few months after that of Julian Fane, yet whereas the latter had to make a concession to Victorian public opinion by mentioning Heine's moral turpitude, the former dared to speak of Heine's moral greatness and to plead for a juster appreciation of Heine's rare talents, which gave glory to his youth and which did not desert him in the bitterest sufferings of his maturity. The martyr of Montmartre was, in the opinion of Milnes, completely misunderstood by his time. "With so acute a sense of classical forms and antique grace as to make him often well content to live 'A Pagan suckled in a creed out-worn,' he was regarded as a chief of the Romantic School; with a genial and pleasure-loving temperament, he was mortified by physical infirmity and moral disappointment into a harsh and sometimes cruel satirist; with a deep religious sentiment, and even narrow theological system, he was thrust into the chair of an apostle of scepticism; with no clear political convictions or care for theories of government, he had to bear all the pains and penalties of political exile, the exclusion from the commerce of the society he best enjoyed, and the inclusion among men from whom he shrank with an instinctive dislike."¹²

Milnes called Heine "the living shade of the Champs Elysees" and to many Englishmen he was indeed a living shade ever since 1847 when the false rumor of his death went the rounds of the press. It was this rumor which Heine denied in the epilogue to *Romanzero*, when he reported that the measure had already been taken for his coffin and for his

¹¹ T. Wemyss Reid: *Life, Letters, and Friendships of Richard Monckton Milnes, First Lord Houghton*, London, 1890, Vol. I, p. 251.

¹² *Edinburgh Review*, July 1856, Vol. CIV, p. 194.

obituary, but that he was dying so slowly that his friends were becoming bored.

The most important of the premature obituaries was written by Henry Fothergill Chorley for the *Athenaeum* of December 4, 1847. It was reprinted in *Gentleman's Magazine* in January 1848 and formed the basis for the pseudo-biographic sketch by W. H. Hurlbut in the *North American Review* a year later. Chorley mirrored the opinions of the average educated Englishman of the Eighteen-Forties. He lacked the first hand knowledge of Milnes and the thoroughness of Julian Fane, but he was not unsympathetic in his approach. He recalled that Heine's *Sketches of German Literature of the Nineteenth Century* were first undertaken for the *Athenaeum*, but that their tone and temper precluded the possibility of their appearing in an English periodical. He regretted that Heine's appetite for raillery and satire swallowed up his more poetic vein. "From the moment when he commenced the career of a political controversialist, Heine would appear also to have begun that game of cross-purposes with Life in the playing of which genius too often takes a morbid or cynical pleasure, — certain, alas! to lose. He connected himself with European liberalism — without having mastered the truth that such a profession of faith demands energy, uprightness and self-sacrifice to distinguish the apostle of liberty from the apologist of license. In proportion as he gave up writing *Reisebilder* and fairy tales for social and political satire, the taste for mockery spread. From laughing at 'creeds outworn,' he took to laughing at everyone's and at his own sincerity. Such mirth — the death-rattle of poetry — can no more be heard without pain than the dismal convulsions which announce the extinction of physical life."¹³

While English readers were being given details of Heine's death, he was engaged in negotiations with "Her Majesty's Theatre" for the production of a ballet on the subject of Faust. The prospectus of this London opera house promised this ballet for the season of 1847 and preparations were already in progress for its staging, when Benjamin Lumley, the director, ordered its removal from the repertoire, despite the expenses lavished upon this work by the manager. In his reminiscences, published in 1864, Lumley reprinted his correspondence with Heine from 1847 to 1852 regarding this ballet and gave his reasons for laying it aside. "True, it was the work of a poet; but of a poet unacquainted with the necessities of stage representation, especially in England — of a man of powerful imagination, who presupposed that a public would see the effects as *he* saw them, and feel with *his* feelings. In short, the execution of the ballet was an impossibility."¹⁴

Although Heine's ballet on *Faust* was not produced in England because of practical difficulties, nevertheless the fact that its staging was

¹³ *Athenaeum*, December 4, 1847, p. 1247.

¹⁴ Benjamin Lumley: *Reminiscences of the Opera*, London, 1864, p. 199.

seriously considered by the Court theatre clearly indicated that the early hostility towards the poet was waning. The moral reasons, which once weighed so heavily against the poet and which in 1834 prevented the *Athenaeum* from opening its columns to him, no longer seemed so important. Englishmen still did not justify his apparent moral aberrations but they sought to explain them and to discover mitigating circumstances. Faults he undoubtedly had, but were they not the faults of his time? Might not his sneers and his scepticism be ascribed to his desire to wean his countrymen from their pet failings?

The Revolutoin of 1848 accustomed the European reading public to extreme boldness of utterance, to pungency of style, and to a questioning of fundamental socail values. Compared with the communistic tracts of Marx, Engels, and Lasalle, Heine's satirical essays seemed mild and entertaining. As a political pamphleteer, Heine was losing caste. Retaining pre-revolutionary slogans in post-revolutionary years, he was gradually becoming obsolete and ineffective. As a poet, on the other hand, he could now reckon with universal admiration. His songs, once considered as the frivolous ebullitions of a childish fancy were taking a firm hold of the English no less than of the German mind.

Tait's *Edinburgh Magazine* devoted two issues in 1851 to a study of *Heine, His Works and Times*. The study was a defense of the poet against his accusers. It blamed the disastrous Napoleonic age for the unpleasant metamorphosis of a personality that was originally soft, patient, forbearing, and open to feelings of tenderness and admiration. It blamed Heine's environment for the deterioration of his sensitive, humble, and loving mind. It blamed his supposed descent from a Jewish father and a Christian mother for the conflicting strains which troubled his soul. Though it could not guarantee his sincerity, it defended him on the ground that authors in general were insincere. "The memoirs of literary men of all times and nations reduce us to the sad necessity of considering the very best authors in the light of actors. We remember the rigorous respectability of Goldsmith's writings in connection with the excesses of his private life. We think of Sterne's public sensibility and private hardness of heart: he neglects his mother and bewails the fate of a dead jackass. We remember, also, the glorious aspirations for liberty in Goethe's *Faust*, the tragic pathos in *Iphigenia*, and the exquisite touches of female heroism in *Clavigo*, and we compare with them the cold, selfish, and overbearing character of the author's self. With warnings like these, we are by no means inclined to stand up for Heine's sincerity. Perhaps he was as little sincere as his fellows, whose professional cant is not the less admired for being known as such."¹⁵

Fraser's Magazine joined other publications of the Eighteen-Fifties in toning down its dislike of Heine, the political satirist, and in stressing the achievements of Heine, the poet. In an article on *Young Germany*, which

¹⁵ Tait's *Edinburgh Magazine*, 1851, Vol. XVIII, p. 621.

appeared in January 1854, it voiced satisfaction that this group, of which Heine was the head, had lost its political influence. Heine alone was deemed worthy of respect because, in the epilogue to *Romanzero*, he had the manly courage to admit his errors. In politics, he must be classed as a rebellious Titan, heaving mountains, destroying much, without building up anything high, solid, or enduring. In poetry, on the other hand, he remained ever resplendent and his visions were unmarred by his bodily torture. *Romanzero*, composed when he was physically dead to all sensation and hopeless of recovery, furnished additional proof of his genius. "The mind of the man, always lively, energetic, fresh for the conflict, seems, however, to have kindled into even greater clearness and force under this awful infliction. His constant flashing satire, exquisitely lyric faculty, wonderful humor, and subtle genius are revived with tenfold vigor, and glow with unquenchable brilliancy, and he is yet more than a match for them who may have the ill-fortune to come across him."¹⁶

Heine's long illness and the fortitude with which he bore his misfortunes won him much sympathy in England. If the *Travel Sketches* and the political tracts of young Heine outraged English public opinion, *Romanzero* and the *Confessions* of the dying Heine effected a lasting reconciliation. The martyr of Montmartre spoke to the hearts of readers who had failed to react to the splenetic pamphleteer. In January 1855, a year before his death, the *Westminster Review* eulogized him as follows: "Poor Heine! these latest touches of his pen will excite the admiration of every reader of French and German, wherever in the habitable globe these languages are studied, while the writer, with pale countenance and eyes half-closed with pain, lays a head weary with a long life-battle on the pillow of sickness, in the Rue d'Amsterdam, where it has now settled for the last five years. And such is Fame! Yet the Titan though o'erthrown is unconquered still, and the old love, laughter, hate, and scorn, are sublimed by suffering in the poet's heart, to such a degree, that we shudder while we gaze, awe-struck, on this victory of man over man's most terrible foes, sickness and pain."¹⁷

It is thus obvious that even before Heine's death the pre-Victorian picture of him as the Belzebub among the poets was gradually yielding to a greater admiration for his unique talents. The first English legend of him as blackguard and apostate never faded wholly, but it was modified by the Early Victorians to include a higher appraisal of his genius. He thus became in their eyes the wit among the poets, the most lucid of German prose writers, the most brilliant of Satan's brood, the Teutonic counterpart of Byron and Voltaire. And before long the mid-Victorians were destined to elevate him to dizzy heights and to superimpose their legend of Heine as the German Aristophanes, Heine as the fulfillment of Goethe, Heine as the peer of Virgil, Dante, and Shakespeare. George Eliot

¹⁶ Fraser's Magazine, January 1854, Vol. XLIX, p. 86.

¹⁷ Westminster Review, January 1855, N.S., Vol. VII, p. 275.

and Matthew Arnold are the chief creators of the mid-Victorian Heine-legend. Their apotheosis of the German poet had a lasting effect upon English public opinion, so that while his reputation in his native land ebbed and flowed with every change in the political structure, his position in England remained secure. Not even the anti-German waves that flooded Britain during two World Wars lessened his hold upon the English mind. During the turbulent years after 1914 and 1939 the Memorial Tablet commemorating his stay in London remained undesecrated and publicists often recalled his devotion to liberty, his crusade against oppressors of every kind, his championship of political and social democracy.

It is to the Early Victorians of a century ago that we owe the turning of the tide, the change from initial hostility to enduring adoration of Heine.



SEALSFIELD — A REPLICATION

NORMAN L. WILLEY
University of Michigan

In view of the great amount of interest, both intellectual and pecuniary, that has been vested in Sealsfield it would be strange indeed if my article in MFDU XXXIV, 6 had remained unanswered. I doubt that it is worth the waste of printer's ink to add anything to what has previously been written, as far as an intelligent and unprejudiced reader of Sealsfield is concerned, yet for the sake of those literary students who do not have time to devote to this obscure author I should like to reply briefly to the article that appeared in MFDU XXXV, 5, pp. 71-85.

This article follows a common procedure in suspecting that anyone with a non-German name does not understand German. In one instance a specific instance is given, where, it is asserted, I have shown my ignorance, I have taken *frösteln* as an indication of a temperature below 32° F.

I readily admit that there are many things in the German language that I do not know in spite of some time and effort that I have devoted to the study of it; but I should like to suggest that the most of Sealsfield's writings are not in *German* but in a mixed lingo *sui generis* which no teacher would use in a class where he attempts to teach *German*.

At any rate the *frösteln* allegation is quite irrelevant. Allow me to repeat the passage quoted. Sealsfield wrote in SN, III, 456: "... es goß wie aus Schläuchen vom Himmel herab; und dazu piff der Norte so schneidend kalt, daß meine guten Landsleute trotz Jugend und Mäntel und Punschbowle sich kaum des Fröstelns erwehren konnten." Two pages later he causes the weather to clear: "... eine Minute zuvor war alles kalt und fröstig und erstarrt, jetzt dampfte alles in den glühenden, versengenden Strahlen der Nachmittagsonne."

The defense declares: "... Willey mistranslated 'frösteln' with 'freezing'."

The defense objects to my suggestion that Sealsfield would have known more about the *norte* "if he had read Humboldt's *Essai politique*." I think that my sentence is justifiable as English even if Sealsfield may have glanced at the work sometime or other. In the matter of the *norte* Humboldt gives some very exact data which Sealsfield did not use.

The statement that Sealsfield knew both Humboldts, although quite irrelevant, rests only on Sealsfield's own word and his evidence in matters pertaining to himself is notoriously impeachable, compare e. g. the false claim he made of having been an editor of the *Courrier des Etats-Unis*.

Very interesting indeed is the remark, made by the defense, that further research should be undertaken to determine the question of the position of the calf on the legs of the slaves imported from Africa. Of course, the inference is that Sealsfield may have been right in his assertion that Geo. Howard's negroes had the calf in front. However, until some

¹ I must remark that the italics are mine.

new Djordjewitsch or Meyer writes a Sealsfield dissertation with an exhaustive examination of all contemporary literature on the nigger's leg I shall continue to believe that the musculature of *all* members of the *genus homo sapiens* (which term I hope I may use without provoking racial tension among Louisiana readers) is essentially the same. I believe that the remark is on a par with Sealsfield's assertion that Mexicans have slant eyes.

It used to be a current saying in the North, where Negroes were practically unknown, that the only way to fight a member of the race was to kick him in the shins; for he had the calf in front and his head was so hard that he could not be injured by hitting him with a club. Sealsfield's knowledge of the negro was academic, just as was his knowledge of the *osculus humanus*, which is his artistic elaboration of the note of Clavijero on the monkeys of Mexico, some of which, it is declared, are as tall as a man and are called Zambos by the natives. Sealsfield took all this in good faith and adopted even the name.²

That Sealsfield was right in the agricultural data he gives is enthusiastically and wittily supported by the defense. It alleges that the allusion to the feeding of Kentucky cattle on *grünem Cottonsamen* (II, 228) is whimsical, like the characterization of the Arkansas backwoodsman as half horse half alligator. Certainly, as it stands, any humor in the hyperbole is of very low tension, and very probably it is a garbled form of something Sealsfield had heard in Pennsylvania.

I quite agree with the defense that Sealsfield's *mit grünem Cottonsamen* probably comes from an original English *green seed cotton*, the German version is simply a rationalization of "farmer" Sealsfield. However, anyone who knew anything about cotton — and this green seed cotton was the kind most generally cultivated — would never have made this German translation, he would have said *Grünsamenbaumwolle* or the like. Imagine anyone saying *Baumwollölsamen* for *Baumwollsamenöl*! The words are a naive confession of Sealsfield's ignorance. For the metathesis compare the distinguished American *Henry Patrick* whom Sealsfield mentions several times.

A similar confusion is contained in Sealsfield's reference to the obstructions of traffic in the Mississippi (V, 31): Sandbänke, Snakes, Sawyers, Planters, und wie tie T-I alle heißen. A footnote explains: Snakes, Sawyers, Planters — die bekannten Fährlichkeiten, die in Gestalt von in den Flußschlamm eingesenkten Baumstämmen die Reise auf dem Mississippi selbst noch heut zu Tage so gefährvoll machen. The *Snakes* is no name that Sealsfield received first hand, some Pennsylvania informant told him about the *snags*, which became (with German speech habits) *schnacks* and through the author's rationalization *Snakes*.

² Clavijero: *Storia di Messico*, I. p. 75: Vene (scimie) sono di varia grandezza e figura, delle piccole e singolarmente graziose, delle mezzane della corpulenza d'un Tasso, e delle grandi, forti, feroci, e barbute, le quali chiamansi da alcuni Zambos. Queste quando stanno ritte, come fanno, sopra due piede, agguagliano tal volta la statura d'un uomo.

The great size of the cotton plant alleged by Sealsfield is corroborated, it is urged, by the height of sea island cotton, by the fact that Charlevoix³ in 1722 saw "very fine cotton on the tree," and by the fact that Germans call cotton *Baumwolle*, not *Strauchwolle*. This exhibition of erudition is, however, irrelevant and impertinent; for sea island cotton was not cultivated in Louisiana in Sealsfield's time, and Charlevoix does not tell how *big* the tree was. As to the corroborating evidence of *Baumwolle* I can only wonder at the brilliant versatility of the proposal. That the name used by a people in whose country cotton cannot grow, by a people who had not even a casual acquaintance with the cotton plant, should have any weight in determining the size of the plant in its primitive form is logic that attracts attention. I wonder what such an advocate could not prove with *garstiges Fieber*, *Renntier*, *türkisch Korn*, *Welschhuhn*, *Bockbier*, *Scharbock*, *Küchenschwabe* and *schnelle Kathrine*! I cannot believe, of course, that the defense is ignorant of the fact that *Baumwolle* is only a popular etymology, that the earliest recorded form of the word was *baurwol* and that the first syllable has nothing to do with *tree* but is to be associated with Latin *bombax* (cotton).

I wonder if the defense discovered, while looking up data on cotton in the 1820's, whether the amount a man picked in a day was commonly called *pensum* (pl. either *pensums* or *pensa*) as Sealsfield gives it in II, 338 *et passim*. Both Sealsfield's whites and his blacks use this term.

The assertion that the people of Rapides Parish *do* husk their corn on the stalk and leave the ears to ripen exposed to the blistering sun, the Louisiana bacteria, the birds and the ants amazes me and I have no doubt it would also amaze Vice President Wallace.⁴ My amazement is somewhat lessened, however, by the inference that *not all* the farmers of Rapides treat their corn in this way, evidently some of them believe, as I *had* done, that nature provided the husk on the ears for some purpose.

Of course, Nathan and his fellow squatters were from Kentucky and in Kentucky people do not resort to this novel way of ripening corn. I had imagined that Sealsfield might have noticed something that is often done in the Appalachian country, the cultivator strips the corn stalk of leaves and top to use them as fodder, but he leaves the husk on the ear untouched; in that region the ears would be ruined if left exposed. One might ascribe to Sealsfield's artistry and agricultural acumen the addition of the husking.

I also should like to suggest that some doctoral candidate further investigate the topic of maize in Sealsfield's time. Evidently the plant was somewhat different then from what we generally believe; for I note that

³ Brackenridge, *Views of Louisiana*, Baltimore 1817, mentions Charlevoix among other writers in his preface and concludes (p. 10) that: "The travels of Frenchmen in general, are bedizened with conceits of the fancy, and those of Englishmen loaded with sluggish prejudice."

⁴ I gratefully acknowledge the compliment the defense gives me in associating the names Dr. Wallace and Dr. Willey.

in VS 41 Sealsfield states that in Lancaster, Ohio: "Ich sah auf meinem bisherigen Wege schönes Wälschkorn, doch konnte es mit dem in dieser Gegend keinen Vergleich aushalten. Ich maß Stöcke von 22 bis 25 Fuß Länge, an denen sich zwei bis drei starke Kolben befanden." Evidently the tall corn of Iowa has involved a waste of years of careful breeding; seed corn from Lancaster would have given better results than Iowa farmers have yet obtained.

The period when green corn was eaten was also somewhat different in Sealsfield's time from what it is now; for he writes in VS, 16: "Wälschkorn ist ein Lieblingsgericht der Amerikaner: sowie die Körner gelb werden, wird es allgemeines Supper." I wonder if Sealsfield ever took part in a corn roast.

Evidently the defense reads somewhat carelessly; for the passage that I employed to show how uncritical Sealsfield was, how he soberly repeated the old wife's tale about Irish potatoes changing into sweet potatoes when planted in Texas soil, is quoted to show that Sealsfield *did* know the difference between potatoes and sweet potatoes. I said that "... he was unaware of how essentially different" the two are, they do not belong to the same genus and cannot mix or run into each other.

That Sealsfield introduced this degeneration into sweet potatoes as a bit of humor, as the defense suggests, is certainly not true; for here in the entire context Sealsfield is copying closely the narrative of the anonymous author of *A Visit to Texas*, N. Y. 1834. The original reads (p. 24): "It is remarkable of the common North American or Irish potatoe, that when cultivated here it becomes sweet, like the Southern or Carolina potatoe." "Farmer" Sealsfield, who "described only what he had himself seen and seen frequently" accepted this hearsay as the sober truth and with his best learned air added a few details, *Solanum tuberosum*, instead of becoming sweet in flavor all in one planting requires two plantings for the complete change and instead of merely turning sweet it actually becomes *Batatas batatas*.

A similar treatment is found in Sealsfield's description of the garrison of Mexican soldiers at the mouth of the Brazos. The *Visit to Texas* (p. 14) states: "There were ten or twelve puny, dark complexioned men, at Captain Cotton's in an uniform, who I learnt were Mexican soldiers, stationed there to enforce the revenue laws." The realistic Sealsfield improves this account in the *Cajütenbuch* (I, 27) as follows: Vor dem Blockhause bivouakirte die gesammte Garnison, eine Compagnie, aus zwölf zwergartigen, spindelbeinigen Kerlchen bestehend, die ich mir mit einer Reitpeitsche alle davon zu jagen getraut hätte, keiner größer als unsre zwölf- oder vierzehnjährigen Buben, und bei weitem nicht so stark, aber alle mit furchtbaren Backen- und Knebel- und Zwickel- und allen Arten von Bärten, auch gräulichen Runzeln. It should be noted here that the addition of these hirsute adornments to the beardless Mexicans and the allegation of dwarflike size was made by the same author who has merited from

Sealsfield scholars such unstinted praise for his exact knowledge of the Mexican *castes* in his *Virey*.

The highly artistic *Patriarch* of the *Cajütenbuch* also has the typical Sealsfield treatment. In the original (p. 37) it is only a big live oak with so much Spanish moss that from a distance it looked grey and suggested a patriarch. Sealsfield added that the first branches were forty feet from the ground, the moss hung so low that it had to be pushed aside when one went under the tree, and a cathedral hush and dimness reigned beneath it.

The defense suggests that Sealsfield is right in his assertion that potatoes were imported from Ireland to Rapides in 1828. I should like to quote in reply statements by Sealsfield. In VS 210 he declares that on his trip down the Mississippi: Am ersten März erhielten wir überall auf freiem Felde (he was just above N. O.) gewachsene Kartoffeln, grüne Erbsen und Artischocken. In the *Cajütenbuch* II, 287 also he mentions potatoes cultivated by the Irishman Phelim.

As to the authorities that are quoted in support of the Irish exportation to Rapides I should like to call attention to the fact that one refers to conditions in South Carolina forty-five years before the time of Geo. Howard, while the other states that the potato is "extensively cultivated especially in Europe and the Northern United States" i. e. that it is cultivated in the South, to be sure, but more extensively in the North. As to the intended corroboration in the statement that dairy products etc. were brought down from the North on flat boats I should like to call attention to the fact that the Mississippi furnished the power, the flat boats were broken up and sold as lumber in N. O. and the time required was a couple of weeks. This is no matter of shipping in potatoes by sailing vessels from a point five thousand miles away.

The deceptive name *Irish* potatoes probably comes from the fact that in an Irish famine the potato saved the lives of the inhabitants, not because the tuber was extensively exported from Ireland or was of superior quality there. The laws of supply and demand certainly militate against any export of potatoes from Ireland to Louisiana.

The defense attorney passionately advocates the ferocity and the howl of the Louisiana alligator, and he cites contemporary evidence in support of his traverse.

Here again is an occasion for a Sealsfield dissertation, the alligator, like the musculature of the African leg, should be further investigated on the basis of contemporary literature; the domesticated alligator on the numerous alligator farms is apparently too busy producing leather to be reliable in the matter of roaring and in his appetite for human flesh. However, there must be some limit in introducing contemporary evidence, Baron Münchhausen may not be adduced as competent to testify on the habits of *alligator mississippiensis*.

The Ashe citation submitted by the defense cannot be admitted to

prove the alligator's quondam vocalic range, it is too evidently nature faking. Alligators do not swim about a boat and peep into it with their heads raised high above water; their anatomy is such that it would be impossible unless their vertebrae were rearranged by an osteopath. Neither does a seriously wounded animal leave its element to put on a theatrical performance for the benefit of mendacious travellers, a wounded alligator crash dives and swims to safety if he can, usually a hunter has to wait for his alligator until the gases from decomposition float the carcass to the surface. Whether Mr. Ashe's alligator wanted to roar or to sing the Louisiana Blues is inconsequent, he could not have done either under water. Mr. Ashe is a less plausible nature fakir than is Sealsfield himself.

What relevance the notice in the New Orleans Picayune about the alligator in St. Charles St. in 1844 can have I do not see. To me it is only evidence of how rare the animal had become by that time and how little acquaintance the editorial staff of the Picayune had with it. The poor little fellow was only five foot long, helpless and awkward in a strange environment, expecting that at any moment one of the agile bipeds into whose city he had strayed would step up and club him to death. Really the SPCA or the dog catcher should have taken a hand in the case.

Of course, if the citizens of New Orleans had read Sealsfield they would have known exactly what to do to protect their city against an invasion of alligators. In V, 334 ff. an American familiar with the ways of the wilds explains that if horses have bells on them the sound prevents the alligators from coming up on the highway to block their passage. Also when Count Vignerolles paid his visit to the mulatto lady (IV, 250 ff.) he found her alabaster daughters bathing fearlessly in an alligator infested bayou while their servants scared away the beasts by ringing bells and beating on metal vessels. If the Picayune staff had only possessed a string of sleighbells they could have been saved from the anxiety caused them by the visit of the baby gator.

In passing I should like to call attention to a note in VS, 154 which seems to indicate that Sealsfield really was aware that the alligator was comparatively harmless: . . . Alligators, die zwar nicht so gefährlich wie die afrikanischen, doch immer eine Plage sind.

For a better appreciation of Sealsfield's realism and his literary workmanship it may be interesting to compare a contemporary account of an alligator hunt contained in the *Visit to Texas* (p. 133): ". . . we discovered in a low marshy spot sometimes overflowed by the rising of the stream, the largest alligator I ever saw, lying motionless, like a great log. We ventured, without any apprehension, within point blank shot, though nothing would have induced me to place myself within his reach. We both took deliberate aim and fired: and perceived by his motions that we had given him a rather serious wound, though both of us were so ignorant of the animal that we fired at parts of the body almost at a venture. He

seemed to be in a passion, raised his great upper jaw, showing his teeth and occasionally turning over and over like a stuck hog. He endeavored to escape, and to reach the river, but not able to get along without difficulty, and made little progress for an hour and a half, during which we were occupied in attempts to kill him. We struck him with fifteen or sixteen balls in succession, before he was so far disabled, that we were emboldened to approach him. We at last got a rope on him near the head, and found that he had lost blood, particularly from a hole in the neck made by the first shot. He measured sixteen feet, and had been a most formidable animal, though now, to all appearance, scarcely alive. We tied the rope fast to a heavy log, intending to preserve his skin: but on returning next morning were surprised to find the rope broken and the monster gone. A few days afterward we found him dead in the river, with the remainder of the rope on his neck.

It will be noticed that this alligator did not rush up on land when wounded, as did Mr. Ashe's, neither did he roar like Sealsfield's. But, of course, he was a *Texas* alligator.

My opponent passes very lightly over my impeachment of Sealsfield's veracity in regard to the amount of oats his horse ate with the triumphant statement that no data on the American bushel is given on the same page where Sealsfield tells of his remarkable buggy horse. Quite true, but the objection is irrelevant, I did not state that the two things were on the same page, the one is on page 25 of VS, the other on page 74 of III. In VS he writes: Ich lasse Abends stets meinem Pferde $\frac{1}{2}$ Bushel Hafer geben, woran es die ganze Nacht frißt, und dann einen Morgenritt von 10-15 Meilen leicht aushält. Assuming that Sealsfield started by eight o'clock this horse was capable of making $2\frac{1}{2}$ to $3\frac{3}{4}$ miles an hour. Evidently, however, this horse picked up considerably in the afternoon; for in VS, 49 Sealsfield writes: Wir kamen Abends nach einem ziemlich starken Ritte (from Chillicothe) in Columbus an, und besichtigten noch das Innere des Rathauses und die Wohnung des Governors. The distance between these two towns by air is about forty-five miles and by trail it must have been considerably longer.

In spite of his pretended familiarity Sealsfield had only a superficial knowledge of horse flesh, as is seen e. g. in III, 152 where he states that Kentucky pacers are: eine kleine Race von Pferden, die einen kurzen Galopp trab laufen.

The note on the American bushel reads as follows: . . . das bekannte amerikanische und englische Getreide- und Mehлмаß enthält zwischen 90 und 100 Pfund. I submit that not even in Sealsfield's time could a horse eat forty-five pounds of oats in a night and make any distance whatever next morning. Neither would anyone suggest such an amount of oats if he were accustomed to horses.

The defense very wittily objects to my employing a stop watch to check the performance of the stalwart boys in Nathan's squatter settle-

ment. I enjoy the humor of the allegations and can admit that an expression like *five minutes* may be used occasionally in any language for an indefinite *short* period of time, but I fear that the defense has not read the context carefully. The party in the narration was rounding a swamp on their way home when the idea occurred to Nathan that some steps might be spared if trees were felled to make a continuous footbridge over the impassible mud. With the good judgment of an Austrian monk writing in Switzerland about the savage jungles of America Nathan picked out a huge swamp cypress for the first tree to fell. The remarkable squatter boys, who conveniently carried their axes on the mysterious trip to rescue Count Vignerolles and his friends from a prairie fire, immediately set to work to fell the giant and "Ehe fünf Minuten" they had it down. If the "*fünf Minuten*" meant only a reasonably short time, say an hour and a half, which is an unreasonably short time even for lumber-jacks with a crosscut saw in addition to their axes, how long would it have required to make the continuous footbridge across the swamp? Wouldn't Nathan have saved time and fatigue by going around the obstacle as he came?

The advocate of the defense is conveniently near to the ground where the events of the Nathan story are supposed to have taken place; if U. S. 71 is impracticable on account of gasoline rationing or because it is blocked by one of Sealsfield's alligators he can very easily make the trip on the Robert E. Lee, and he has an excellent opportunity to familiarize himself with Nathan's method of making a footbridge. Let him observe whether giants of five foot in diameter are so used and if they are *not* he may ask some Cajan *why* not. Also let him observe whether such footpaths are made of logs lying end to end in the mud (as in the famous alligator swamp over which Nathan's party made their way at night when the crafty alligator pretended to be a part of the bridge. I have seen such bridges, but they were made of small trees that were easily felled and these stood high out of the water, resting on the branches and the stump.

Incidentally it might be illuminating to inquire of any of the descendants of Nathan's contemporaries just how long a *fünf Minuten* they would require to cut down a five foot cypress with axes.

The matter of the magnolias blooming at all times of the year is upheld by the defense as the truth. Of course, an occasional tree may send out a few sporadic blossoms again after it has ceased to bloom, but the *profuse*ness is only an embellishment of Sealsfield's imagination. Let me call to attention again the quotation dated Oct. 5: . . . und Millionen Blumen spielen wie bunte Edelsteine heraus. In IV, 243 (two weeks before cotton picking) *jede* Magnolia . . . mit ihren Kelchblumen shows that all the magnolias were blooming in late midsummer, while the *noch* in V, 308 (noch immer blühenden Magnolien) and in I, 103 (Hie und da funkelte noch eine Magnolia mit ihren schneeweißen Blüten) shows that in cotton picking time and in late autumn the flowering was still going on, i. e.

these trees had not ceased blossoming. I hope no booster literature of Rapides attempts to use Sealsfield's evidence to prove that the magnolias keep on blooming all summer and fall; there will certainly be some disappointed tourists if it is tried.

In connection with the continually flowering magnolias Sealsfield mentions another growth which I should like to have better identified by some scholar familiar with Rapides, the *ficus indicus* (sic) in I, 103 . . . dem ficus indicus und seinen langen Blättern und Gurkenfrüchten.

The little monk was fond of flowers, apparently, and put them into his landscape with no regard for reality, as we see in SN III, 400: Wir waren in . . . dem Weingarten Mexicos; — alle Hügel, alle Bergelehnen bis an ihre bewaldeten Scheitel⁵ mit der prachtvollsten Agave americana bekränzt, Millionen blühender Agaven, ihre grell gelb und roth goldenen Kelche und Blüthen wie Juwelenströme erglänzend, ein Aroma ausdünstend, das die Sinne berauschte, in trunkene Schlafseligkeit wiegte. In one of Sealsfield's learned notes in *Der Virey* (appendix of vol. 2) the cultivation of the maguey is described (with an amusing error or two) and he tells (as is quite correct) that the centre of the plant is removed at the time the flower stalk is about to shoot up. No maguey in the *Weingarten Mexicos* has ever been allowed to flower and the imaginative monk's millions of flowering plants is an even greater exaggeration than his millions of Louisiana Magnolia blossoms in October.

In the course of his Sealsfield research, no doubt, the defense has investigated the matter of Sealsfield's mangrove trees growing in fresh water and far from the Gulf. In IV, 243, 244, 248, he has his hero find in the old Attacapas County a Seechen mit Mangroven, — in dessen Mangrovenrändern, — mit der Mangrove eingefafßt, — Thränenweiden und Mangroven. Nowadays the mangrove all over the world grows in brackish water along the coast only, but it may have had other habits then, if the contemporary Negroes had a different musculature.

As Sealsfield's fondness for flowers leads him to decorate his landscapes, so his educated European palate sometimes makes him cause his characters to indulge in delicacies not quite in keeping with the times and the circumstances. He had evidently eaten canvas backs in Philadelphia, where they were esteemed a delicacy, as their feeding on a kind of wild celery about Chesapeake Bay imparted a special flavor to their flesh. Elsewhere, however, the flesh of the canvas back is not superior to that of any other duck. It is to be noted with what gustatory ecstasy Sealsfield tells of the canvas backs in the banquet given by Menou in IV, 37.

Sealsfield's favorite wines were apparently madeira and sherry; for he introduces them both in that earthly paradise, Nathan's squatter domain. Nathan had twelve demijohns of madeira shipped him from New Orleans, and Mr. Dreadnought regaled his guests with excellent sherry.

⁵ I will pass over without comment the realism of forest clad mountain tops in Mexico and the perfume of the maguey.

This not only shows complete disregard of the stern life and the absence of luxuries in a frontier settlement but it flouts all Kentucky traditions where legal (as well as illegal) liquor has a higher potency. Doughby is in this matter a much better Kentuckian, as was Nathan himself with his *Magentrost* so frequently mentioned in the first part of his narrative (e. g. V, 39: sieben Gallon Magentrost . . . westlichen Magentrost mögt Ihr ihn wohl nennen, besonders wenn er ächter Monongehala (sic) ist . . .).

The defense very cleverly turns against me the testimony of Brackenridge: *Views of Louisiana*, Baltimore 1817, p. 191,⁶ to prove that Mr. Cockley's yearly peregrinations to Mexico City with his drove of mules from Missouri was quite plausible.

That the trip to Papantla was possible in 1817, as far as the obstructions of nature were concerned, is true with reservations. However, in Sealsfield's text it was a matter of driving a big herd of mules. In the arid parts the matter of fodder would have created difficulties. The necessary subjection to the grafting Mexican toll collectors would have made the venture unprofitable and the risk from Comanches and bandits would have made it unattractive; for conditions in the republic were much worse than after the fall of Porfirio Diaz, when overland communication with the capital was cut off. The trip is somewhat longer than from New York to Omaha and would have required at least two months. When the roadweary herd arrived there would have been competition with locally bred animals and with the cheaper imports by sea.

The logic in the statement that Sealsfield's *Maulthier* is unfairly translated as *mule* because Sealsfield uses it synonymously with *Packesel* is not quite evident. Was Cockley driving *Packesel* from Missouri to Mexico? Did Sealsfield mean *Packesel* when he declared that *Maulthiere* were the common beasts of burden in Mexico? I am sure that his limited knowledge could explain the situation, but if he *knew the difference* between *Maultier* and *Esel* it is strange that he confused in his language two such common words. Moreover he seems to have believed that the *mule* was the only beast of burden in Mexico; for in the introduction to *Der Virey* (p. 72) he quotes Goethe's: Das Maultier sucht im Nebel seinen Weg and then compares it with a part of the road between Vera Cruz and Mexico where: zu jeder Stunde des Tages das Maultier in langen Reihen hinan klimmt.

Every tourist will readily admit that mosquitos are bad in Louisiana, but one cannot take Sealsfield's story in IV, 191 as anything but nature faking. Count Vignerolles had been sleeping peacefully . . . als mich ein brennendes Jucken an den Armen und im Gesicht aus dem Schlaf weckte. Amadee (his servant) stand vor mir; — er hatte die Musquittovorhänge zurückgeschlagen und sogleich waren einige dieser Insekten über mich hergefallen, um mein frisches ausländisches Blut zu versuchen. I doubt

⁶ If, however, the writer will refer again to this page he will find that nothing of the sort is there printed.

that a French servant in Louisiana would have pulled open the mosquito netting to wake his sleeping maser, although in New York and Philadelphia Sealsfield might not have had occasion to observe it, but that those bloodthirsty Attacapas mosquitos zinged through the opening in close formation and waked the sleeper before his servant could rouse him is more incredible than that "the president of a great southern university" should be found on the chain gang.

No doubt the defense has had the opportunity of familiarizing itself with the Louisiana centipede, and I wonder if it will maintain that Sealsfield was correct in his observations when he describes it in II, 114: *Millepieds, auch centipeds genannt. Ein giftiges Insekt (sic), von der Länge eines Zolles bis zu zwei Zollen, und der Dicke eines Regenwurmes. Der Stich ist tödlich, wenn die Wunde vernachlässigt wird.* This seems to be a tale of a person who had sometime seen the harmless little millipedes of Pennsylvania and did not know the handsome Louisiana "insect."

Very probably it would be alleged by the defense that Sealsfield's knowledge that "the land crabs have got him" was in his time equivalent to "He has been buried" (II, 30) proves that he knew his Louisiana. But it is as fallacious as the inference drawn from the mention of a dishonest count of votes; for in his zeal to impress his readers with his exhaustive knowledge he annotates the passage with: *Diese Thiere sind in zahlloser Menge in Louisiana und zernagen alles, was ihnen in den Weg kommt.* It certainly is not the common impression that the fiddlers are so destructive.

As the defense barrister knows his Louisiana so well, I wonder what he thinks of the Sunday school picture that Sealsfield gives of a hard-boiled Kentuckian who lived in Woodville, New Feliciana County⁷ (sic): *Auch nicht die leiseste Verdacht eines Umganges mit Schwarzen Quateeroons oder weißen Schönheiten haftet auf ihn* (II, 179). This outstanding man, Doughby, was a combination of clever business man, swashbuckling daredevil and unscrupulous politician. Sealsfield allows him to drink whiskey in generous quantities but does not allow him to indulge in the tobacco chewing universally practiced by contemporary gentlemen. Neither does this Kentuckian swear and he had in addition the ideal chastity of a monk. It would seem that in drawing this character the bespectacled little Austrian author revealed unfamiliarity with his Pappenheimer. Also the chance visit of Vignerolles to the house of the Mulatto lady caused such an ostracism that no house was open to him among the prudish Creoles and his hero Nathan would not receive him socially until he had purged himself of the smirch on his chastity.

I should like to ask a competent authority on Louisiana if the cattle of his country behave as indicated by Sealsfield in IV, 240, where his hero,

⁷ Aside from the fact that Woodville is in Mississippi Sealsfield is somewhat inaccurate in his notion of the new Feliciana County (West Feliciana Parish); for he bounds it in VS, 137 as follows: *New Feliciana grenzt nördlich an den Staat Mississippi, südlich an Ost Baton Rouge, und südöstlich an den Amite.* Evidently the map he consulted when he wrote VS dated from before the division of Feliciana.

Howard, saw a herd of 1000 mavericks with wild horses among them. When they were alarmed by Howard's approach to within 20-30 paces the cattle snorted, the horses whinnied, and they scattered *in all directions*, running madly. In contemporary literature wild horses did not mingle with wild cattle, each associated with his own kind. Outside of Louisiana, too, frightened cattle and frightened horses stampede in a body following their leader, their gregarious instinct makes them keep together, and they never scatter in all directions when threatened by danger. Were the Louisiana cattle in Sealsfield's days broad minded enough to associate with mustangs and did they scatter like a covey of birds when alarmed? Or is there some highly artistic nature faking in the account?

Granting for the sake of the argument that the *oder* in *eine Horde* *Prairiedogs* oder *Wölfe* does not introduce an appositive, I should still require that the defense explain away the Horde. Does it mean a *prairie dog village*? If so, it refers equally to the wolves. If it means *pack* then the prairie dogs also were in a pack.

As to the reference thirty-four pages before, it is probable that Sealsfield had another animal in mind or was borrowing from a different source, just as in the case of Spanish moss in VS and in *Cajütenbuch*. In this previous passage also it is evident that Sealsfield was not a close observer or attempted to embellish another man's account. In . . . und die Hügelnchen von Schmutz, in denen nicht selten wie *Prairie dogs*, *Ratten* und *Mäuse* umherspringen (III, 304) *Schmutz* is hardly the material of which a prairie dog constructs his circular dike against flooding from rain. If it means *mud* it is entirely wrong, for prairie dogs do not live in wet ground. If it means filth, etc., it is quite misleading; for the animal uses earth from its burrow, not filth. Rats are commensals of the human race, not of *cynomys*. As to mice living in prairie dog burrows it would seem that the association would be somewhat unprofitable, as both rodents live on the same food. Other observers have usually mentioned owls and rattlesnakes as the prairie dog's lodgers.

The defense contends that Negro speech has changed since Sealsfield's time. I imagine that it has, but I have Sealsfield's own word that the *thou* of the passage quoted: *Dou darlint . . . dou lilly lilly Nigger boy be — dou my darlint be* etc. was incorrect; for in *Cajütenbuch* II, 382 he states: *Es ist wohl kaum nötig, zu bemerken, daß das Genius der englischen Sprache kein Du oder Sie zuläßt, und daß der Verfasser, wenn er seine Personen sich mit Du oder Sie anreden läßt, bloß dem der deutschen Sprachweise huldigt.*

His *Negersprache* is only a traveller's local color. There is nothing about the Negro's vocal apparatus to prevent exact reproduction, nothing in his mentality that causes him to place his verb in final position. Sealsfield's postposition of the verb is only due to the fact that his own German infinitive followed its modifiers. The Mulatto woman in IV, 154 ff. also uses the infinitive for all forms of the verb and also practices post-

position in French, but inconsistently the Mulatto woman in IV, 102, who speaks Spanish, inflects her verb and puts it in the right position.

In the matter of the *Wälschhühnergeyer* I give all credit to the defense advocate's acquaintance with both Creoles and turkeys; but I must call his attention to the fact that the wild turkey — as he supposes is the case with the Negro's leg — has changed considerably in the course of a century. The wild turkey of today is a timid bird, but this is due to his association with man, it is not by nature more timid than any other large bird. If a buzzard of Sealsfield's time had been so imprudent as to drop into a flock of turkeys, instead of scattering in fright they would have acted as modern domesticated turkeys would behave, they would have pulled a few feathers off him and chased him away. Sealsfield's simile is bad.

The defense considers it a defect of my impeachment that I gave no consideration to the "wise and farseeing treatment Sealsfield gives to the slavery problem." I do not care to discuss this topic, I consider it quite impertinent, and probably it is being adequately treated by some article or dissertation in contemporary Germany, for Sealsfield has experienced a considerable revival of interest in that totalitarian country.

The affirmation that my "article very seriously threatens the entire future position of Sealsfield" distresses me. I shall, however, plead that it is only *damnum absque injuria*, my conscience tells me that the cause of truth is more important than the cause of Sealsfield. Moreover the future is not so black as it might be; for the rest of the century there is enough written material to be reevaluated and disproved to provide dissertation writers and other researchers with material, and next century perhaps there may be an opportunity for Rettungen, the abnormal psychology of alligators, auto hypnosis of Sealsfield scholarship and the like may provide a fertile new field.

In conclusion I am strongly of the persuasion that the "microscope" under which the defense puts my citations is just another of the "What have you not's" left behind by the quondam Commendatore della Corona d'Italia.



DIFFICULT GERMAN PARTICLES

T. A. RATTLER, *St. Rita's Monastery*
Racine, Wisconsin

One of the most troublesome chapters of the German grammar is the one dealing with certain particles which are frequently used as interjections. Where is there to be found, e. g., a satisfactory analysis of an exclamation such as: *Das ist ja aber denn doch auch noch schon schrecklich*. Now these and other like particles occur not only in exclamations but are a quite ordinary and general element of the German sentence. Diekhoff voices the common opinion of writers on the subject when he says that "interjections . . . are beyond rules, being the spontaneous expression of more or less intense feeling" (*The German Language*, p. 508 f.). However, the matter does not seem to be quite so hopeless despite its undeniable difficulties. While it may not be possible to work out rules capable of mechanical application, it seems possible to clarify the grammatical function of these particles, the setting forth of which is the main purpose of this paper. Naturally there will be a little discussion of their origin and development in order to establish their basic implications and force which underlie the use of these particles as interjections. The subject no doubt is capable of deeper penetration and greater precision of statement than is attempted here. But since this study is not exactly in the line of his interests, the writer gladly leaves its further exploration and scientific formulation to scholars better versed in these matters.

Before taking up the study of the individual particles a few general remarks are in place. To begin with, most German particles are more than mere expressions of indistinct emotional stress. There are such, e. g., *ah, oh*; but these constitute no problem. The German interjections have a logical function beside the psychological, the two being intimately fused and delicately adjusted to each other. Slight shifts of logical relationship are immediately reflected in the appearance or disappearance of the one or the other particle. They are not only "a general expression of the attitude of the speaker to his utterance, or of the manner in which it is to be received" (Diekhoff, l. c. pg. 440); they indicate also logical context. The two things cannot be separated. In every communication of thought there is involved a subjective and an objective factor. It is to be expected that the objective thought is so phrased that the full force of its meaning is effectively driven home. All languages have their special devices to effect this result, although they are not of the same kind and equally developed in all languages. We may perhaps say that the German interjections sum up and hint at those elements and factors which are of special subjective relevancy for the effective statement of what the speaker has in mind. Particularly in animated discourse the German recapitulates and concentrates many relevant aspects of the point he wants to make and he does this in the "short-hand" manner of using particles and inter-

jections. Their objective and logical function appears very clearly from the fact, easily established by an analysis of the sentences in question, that the interjections frequently take the place of conjunctions. In fact, many interjections are conjunctions, the difference lying in the more lively and animated use of them.

The psychological pre-occupation is not always of a markedly emotional character but may consist chiefly of an emphasis on the logical and objective element. E. g., *Mein Freund sollte schreiben; er weiß ja, daß ich darauf warte*. Here *ja* is almost purely explanatory like *for* or *because*. But in the sentence, *Mein Freund sollte schreiben; er weiß doch, daß . . .*, the reaction of the speaker as indicated by *doch* is rather temperamental, voicing reproach. When the particles come together in groups, even as few as two, they tend to express a more emotional attitude of the speaker. The accumulation of particles is evidently for the purpose of stressing several relevant points, recalling motives and reflections, urging arguments and the like. The concentration in a sentence of many different considerations, real or fancied or desired, is in itself a sign of aroused emotions. Thus in direct proportion to the increase of the number of particles their objective logical function is obscured and may eventually be lost sight of. Nevertheless it remains there as the basic and guiding element, even where the interjections seem to stand for nothing more than a sheer emotional outburst. The simultaneous presence of several interjections in a sentence and especially the tendency of some to appear together in certain types of sentences may give the impression that their meaning is practically identical. Upon closer examination, however, the real difference in their meaning and the reasons for their concurrence are clearly seen. For a sentence may involve, according to its context, different relationships, interests, emotions and other points of emphasis, each of which requires a distinct particle.

The insistence on the logical function of the interjections is not meant to imply that originally and genetically the logical element was predominating in the formation of these little words. Indeed, it appears much more probable that the words which now serve as the spoken and written symbols of intellectually apprehended relations are the direct results of quite simple and even primitive reactions to certain experiences. This does not preclude the rational element from the process of language formation. For the words are only the external embodiments of ideas however indistinctly conceived. Rudimentary as man's language at one time may have been, it always was, as it is now, the medium for the communication of thought. But the vocal configurations by which rational thought is externalized seem to have received their most primitive form from man's spontaneous reactions, which precede rational reflection. Our thoughts arise from experiences fraught with impressions of the senses and a great variety of reactions of our whole being, such as strong emotions, observational perceptions, internal impulses, external actions and

the like. Similar factors were and still are at work in the diversified development of the original and current forms and their practical uses.

In turning to the study of the particles themselves, we first consider the particle *ja* which expresses affirmation, consent, confirmation, approval. As an interjection *ja* has the function of indicating awareness, recognition, knowledge. This is the basic meaning of *ja*. Now an emphatic reference to or intimation of one's perception and awareness of facts or situations may be occasioned by various circumstances. It is this variety of external concomitants which renders the use of *ja* seemingly as undefinable and chaotic, as it does the use of the other interjections.

In some contexts the sentence re-enforced by *ja* is signalized as an emphatic and clinching argument for the speaker's position. *Ja* fulfills here the logical function of *denn, weil, da*.

Ich war dessen ganz sicher. Ich hatte es *ja* selbst gesehen.
I was quite sure of it. *Why*,¹ I had seen it myself.

Das ist nicht entschuldbar. Man wußte *ja*, daß . . .
This cannot be excused. *Certainly everybody* knew that . . .

A certain emphasis is naturally contained in advice, warning, exhortation, etc. In such cases *ja* intimates the speaker's awareness of special reasons which should make his words impressive.

Dieses Schauspiel müssen Sie *ja* sehen.
You must see this play *by all means*.

Das darfst du *ja* nicht tun.
You must *never* do a thing like this, *never*.

The interjection *ja* occurs in conditional clauses which state unlikely possibilities which do need, however, careful attention if perchance they should become real. It is the recognition of this possible necessity which calls for *ja*.

Falls das *ja* vorkommt, dann . . .
I don't think it will, but if it does happen, then . . .

Wenn das *ja wahr* ist, dann . . .
Now if this really turns out to be true, then . . .

The use of *ja* as an interjection is very obvious in expressions of surprise at the perception of the unexpected, startling.

Die Uhr geht *ja* nicht.
Say, do you know, the watch is out of order.

Du siehst *ja* schrecklich aus.
Goodness, you look terrible.

Still more pronounced is the interjectional character of *ja* in sheer exclamations at taking cognizance of situations which arouse the emotions. The exclamation helps the speaker to gain time for a rationally controlled utterance.

¹ The italicized parts of the translations are so marked and sometimes purposely added as especially expressive of the spirit of the particles under discussion.

Ja, das ist *ja* großartig.
Ab, this is *just* wonderful.

Ja, das weiß ich selbst noch nicht.
Well, I don't know that yet myself.

Ja

Well . . . Or: I declare . . . Or: Say . . . Or: Wait a minute . . . etc.

These latter uses of *ja* give us the key to the understanding of its parent stem. The root of *ja* appears to be the spontaneous exclamation *ah* which is the universal human utterance at becoming aware of something startlingly new or surprising. Apart from the emotional element of surprise, *ah* certainly signalizes awareness, cognizance, knowledge. Thus it is the basis of the particle which expresses affirmation, consent, approval, confirmation. It is to be expected that with its passage into rationally controlled and articulate speech its sound-picture should be softened. This no doubt is the effect of the German *j*. The original form is still preserved in the intensified outcry *ach*, *alas*. Its rational connotation of recognizing in the sense of becoming aware and acknowledging one's awareness is well brought out by the derivatives: *Acht*, *Achtung*, heed, attention, respect; *beachten*, to heed, to take cognizance; *Acht*, *ächten*, proscription, to outlaw; *Beichte*, *beichten*, confession, to confess; *bejahen*, to affirm, confirm. *Ja* in the sense of *sogar*, *even* is equally characterized as an emphatic affirmation as well as a manifestation of surprise, and in this latter function it holds a half-way position between *ja* and *auch*, as will result from the study of this latter particle.

The English particle *also* seems to represent a retrospective summarizing judgment, viz., *al* (*I are*) *so*, or perhaps a contraction of *aljo*, an old Teuton word meaning *other*, and *so*, which would likewise represent a judgment, viz., that *the others are so as the object under consideration*. The German particle *auch* stands for a repeated affirmation by which the same attribute is affirmed (*beachtet* and *bejaht*) of a number of different objects. A series of objects is passed in review, so to speak, under a certain aspect, which being the same for all is noted, as each object passes by, with the sign of affirmation. *Auch* is derived from *ah*, *ach*; cf. the English particle *eke* meaning *also*. The emotionally charged parent stem has left its unmistakable imprint on *auch* in which the emotional element is always faintly stirring even in its most sedate logical function. The English particle *too* being an intensified form of the preposition *to* resembles the German *auch* very closely in this respect.

The basic emotion expressed by *ach*, *alas* is of the nature of painful experiences. *Auch*, its derivative, signalizes reactions and attitudes likely to result from suffering, viz., impatience, complaint, reproach, remonstrance, but also anxiety, longing, desire, fear and the like. By its rational connotation, i. e., repeated recognition of sameness in different objects, *auch* points in the same direction, voicing an unfavorable reaction to the impression of excess, impropriety, incongruity, disproportion, as well as

the sentiments of hope for, expectation and approval of the opposite. In its logical meaning which pervades its many shades of psychological expressiveness, *auch* indicates obvious, natural and necessary relationships of the causal type. That is, *auch* intimates that a given situation is in a general manner the same as situations observed in the past and, hence, warrants the same judgment and conclusion. Thus *auch* sometimes approaches closely the function of *ja* but from a different angle. In this connection it is interesting to note that *ja* and *auch* frequently re-enforce each other in the same sentence and that in such cases *auch* can be dropped without any loss when the sentence is prefaced by *ach*. E. g., *Das ist ja auch schrecklich*. Or: *Ach, das ist ja schrecklich*. Here we see very plainly the origin and genetic kinship of *ja* and *auch*.

Beginning our illustration of the interjectional uses of *auch* with cases in which the logical element predominates or, at least, is very clearly seen, we find *auch* in sentences which are related as statements of cause and effect. *Auch* may occur in either sentence, stressing the natural compatibility or proportionate sameness of the cause and effect, so that the truth of the two statements is made to appear quite obvious and even necessary.

Die Methode war falsch; die Arbeit war *auch* entsprechend schlecht.
 Die Methode war *auch* falsch; die Arbeit war entsprechend schlecht.
 The method was wrong; the work was *accordingly quite* poor.

Wie konnte er es *auch* tun, da ihm niemand half?
 Wie konnte er es tun, da ihm *auch* niemand half?
 How could he do it since nobody helped him? *They ought to have known*.

Kein Wunder, daß es gut ist; er hat es *auch* selbst gemacht.
 Kein Wunder, daß es *auch* gut ist; er hat es selbst gemacht.
 Kein Wunder *auch*, daß es gut ist; er hat es selbst gemacht.
 No wonder that it is *so well* done; he did it himself.

In references to what is expected, desired, feared, or regarded as probable, proper, etc., *auch* indicates the existence of a situation warranting such attitudes.

Das war *auch* zu erwarten.
 That was to be expected.

Was anders wollte er *auch*?
 What else was he looking for, *if not for this*?

Ob das Gerücht *auch* wahr ist?
I wonder if this rumor is true.

Er prüfte, ob *auch* alles gut sei.
 He sampled things *to make sure* that all was good.

O daß es *auch* so wäre.
 Oh, *would* that things were that way.

In expressions of unlimited generalization such as *whoever, whatever,*

whenever, even though, auch indicates that the same condition or intention applies to all contingencies.

Wer und was es *auch* sein mag
Whoever and whatever it may be

Wie dem *auch* sei
However this may be

Wann das *auch* sein mag
Whenever this may be

Wenn *auch* alles verloren geht
Even though all is lost

Ob *auch* die Welt in Trümmer geht
Even though the world goes to pieces

Hätte er *auch* genug Geld
Even if he had enough money

Beweise er es *auch*
Even though he should prove it

In sentences indicating the speaker's search for reasons which would match a situation and explain it, *auch* stresses the concern about the finding of factors which will fit the puzzling situation into an agreeable pattern.

Ich kann es *auch* (gar) nicht verstehen.
I cannot understand it at all.

Es scheint *auch* ganz unmöglich.
It seems altogether *so* impossible.

Was sollte *auch* daran falsch sein;
What could *possibly* be wrong with it?

In its most pronounced emotional use *auch* re-enforces exclamations and statements prompted by what appears as excessive, incongruous, improper, unreasonable, etc.

Auch das noch
And now that too Or: Impossible, impossible

Das ist *auch* zu arg.
This is *really* too much.

Du hast *auch* komische Einfälle.
You *certainly* get strange ideas in your mind.

Was fällt dir *auch* ein?
What is the matter with you? Stop that.

Es ist *auch* wahr
I regret having to use such harsh words. But such things won't do.
(An apologetic closing of an outburst of angry indignation.)

The particle *aber* is classed among the adversative conjunctions. Sometimes *aber* marks complete opposition, e. g., *Ich kann es tun, aber ich tue*

es nicht. Sometimes the opposition is only partial, e. g., *Ich komme, aber nicht heute*. In either case *aber* calls attention to things which are not expected under the circumstances; to things which are likely to be overlooked and thus are apt to strike us as novel, surprising, informative, enlightening, etc. *Aber* urges cognizance of facts, situations, reasons; and in this function it roughly co-incides with the general import of *ja* and *auch*. In fact, the *a* of *aber* seems to be the *ab* from which the other two particles derive. However, the experience which gave rise to the original vocal utterance out of which *aber* eventually developed must have involved, besides the element of perception, another of a startling, shocking, terrifying character. The reaction to this would be, then, one of horror, aversion, rejection. The sound-picture expressing such a reaction would quite naturally combine *b* (cf. the Latin *ab*, away from) and *r* for which we have the best possible illustration in the word *horror* (cf. also the Latin *abhorre*). Certainly these several elements were not joined together upon rational reflection but form an organic unit springing from an original experience. The primitive and even savage outcry which at one time it may have been was gradually softened into the polished form of *aber* which, besides its purely logical function, signalizes all varieties and degrees of surprise, doubt, curiosity, disapproval, helplessness, despair, indignation, but also assurance and other positive and more serene attitudes. However, as an interjection *aber* is largely of a negative mood as are also the other interjections, their employment arising as it does out of a disturbed reaction of the mind. These reflections throw a revealing light on the root meaning of *aber* in words like: *Aberwitz*, pathologically extreme ideas; *Abersinn*, an illogical line of thought; *Aberglauben*, superstition; *abermals*, again, some excess, necessary or not, being felt in the repetition. At any rate, the explanation of *aber* as the comparative of *ab* seems altogether too artificial and unrealistic. Of course, the use of *aber* is no longer bound to obtrusively negative experiences and expressions but enters freely into situations which are more or less indifferent and positively pleasant. This fact is not singular but borne out by the general contingencies of linguistic developments.

Aber is found in expressions of admiration, joy, commendation, due to surprise, however mild, at the discovery of something unexpected or merely suddenly adverted to.

Das ist *aber* großartig.

Oh, this is grand, wonderful.

Das freut mich *aber* sehr.

I *certainly* feel very happy about this.

I *certainly* do appreciate this.

Das hast du *aber* schön gemacht.

You *certainly* did a fine job. Congratulations.

Aber stresses surprise at things which are felt as unexpected and for which no explanation seems to be in sight.

Das hätte ich *aber* nicht gedacht.
I *couldn't imagine* that such a thing would happen.
I am *very much surprised* at this.

Ich kann das *aber* gar nicht verstehen.
I *don't know*, but I can't understand this at all.

In curious and anxious inquiry it is the excitement and perplexity which calls for the use of *aber*.

Aber sagen Sie mal . . .
Say, I *wonder*, can you tell me . . .

Was sollen wir *aber* jetzt tun?
What can we do now, *in this predicament we are in*.

In expressions of shock, surprise, fear, assurance, etc., *aber* is prompted by the feeling of suddenness with which the experience strikes the speaker.

Daß es *aber* so kommen mußte.
That this thing should have happened. I *still can't believe it*.

Jetzt ist *aber* alles verloren.
Now everything is lost. *Let us get out as best we can*.

Jetzt kann es *aber* losgehen.
Now we are set for action. *Let's go*.

In expressions of impatience, indignation, sarcasm, etc., *aber* is designed to convey a sharp rebuke.

Aber warum helfen Sie nicht?
Why don't you help? *Can't you see that help is needed?*

Du scheinst *aber* gar nichts zu wissen.
You don't seem to know anything. *What did you study, if anything?*

Aber, aber, aber.
Hear, hear. Or: Shame, shame. Or: Goodness gracious.

Encouragement and reassurance is re-enforced by *aber* which in this connection voices surprise at the inability of others to see the situation in its true light.

Aber sicher.
Why, certainly.

Sie haben *aber* Angst.
You are *too much* afraid. *Don't be so timid*.

The particle *denn* introduces causal relations which are felt to be of immediate relevancy for the statement of an argument, whereas *weil* simply points out causal connections. Etymologically, *denn* is a variant of *dann* which has purely temporal connotations. While succession in time does not necessarily nor in the majority of cases mean causal dependency, there is often much objective reason for suspecting this relationship. Hence logic's warning against the fallacy: *Post hoc, propter hoc*. Also the English particle of unequal comparison *than* is a variant

of the temporal *then* as the order of time suggests the order of rank which is but another form of comparison.

As a coordinating conjunction *denn* presents positive reasons. As an interjection it refers to reasons but always in a negative sense, i. e., intimating the absence or non-existence of appropriate reasons. Accordingly, *denn* as an interjection occurs in rhetorical and real questions, in exclamations, in unequal comparisons, in statements of exceptions and conditions. Real questions are asked because no indications for judging a situation are in view; rhetorical questions always imply that there are no reasons opposed to the speaker's position. The same applies to exclamations which admit the particle *denn*. The negative element in unequal comparisons and statements of conditions is evident. The use of *denn* in most of these cases might be explained as the vestigial remainder of a complete *denn*-clause which is dropped in animated discourse, its content being too evident to need explicit statement. It is a case similar to the use of *because* in English in instances like: *Why can't I do that? Because . . .*

Denn appears in questions of lively interest in the reasons for a known fact.

Was will er *denn* in der Stadt?

What does he want in the city? *There is no reason for his going there.*

Warum beklagen sich *denn* die Leute?

Why do the people complain. *I see no reason for it.*

Conversely, *denn* signalizes lively interest in questions about the reality of possible facts which the speaker cannot ascertain from the circumstances or his previous information.

Ist es *denn* wahr, daß

Is it *really* true that

Ist *denn* Ihr Freund gekommen?

Has your friend come (*of whose intended visit you spoke*)?

For the same reason, *denn* occurs in questions of lively interest in the nature and implication of facts.

Wer ist *denn* gekommen?

I wonder who has come.

Ist das *denn* so schlimm?

Is this *really* so bad (*as you seem to think*)?

In rhetorical questions *denn* denies the foundation or supporting reasons of an opponent's statements.

Habe ich *denn* das behauptet?

Have I *ever* made this assertion?

Hat man *denn* Beweise dafür?

All right, but can they prove it?

In questions which are meant as a denial *denn* intimates the absence of any justifying reasons for an apparent situation.

Bist du *denn* schon fertig?

You don't tell me that you have finished, do you?

Bist du *denn* noch nicht fertig?

Haven't you finished yet? *It is high time.*

Was ist *denn* los?

What is up? What is going on?, (*to justify a scene like this?*)

Was soll ich *denn*?

What am I *again* supposed to do? *Is there no end?*

In rebukes *denn* makes the rejection of a situation very emphatic by signalizing it as entirely unwarranted.

Das geht *denn* doch nicht.

Now this cannot be tolerated in any case.

Das geht *denn* doch zu weit.

Now this is altogether too much.

In a few cases of unequal comparison *denn* is used instead of *als* which might be used, of course, just as well.

Wer ist größer *denn* Gott?

Who is greater than God?

Heuer war es besser (schlechter) *denn* je.

This year things were better (worse) than ever.

In sentences stating negative conditions *denn* has the meaning of *except, unless*. *Denn* in making the condition points to the reason for it which is practically identical with the condition itself.

Ich lasse dich nicht, du segnest mich *denn*.

I will not leave you unless you bless me.

Das ist nicht möglich, es sei *denn*, daß . . .

This is not possible unless . . .

Das ist unglaublich, es bestünde *denn* die Möglichkeit, daß . . .

This is incredible unless there is the possibility that . . .

The particle *noch* as a word of positive connotation has been said to derive from *und auch*, while in its negative sense it is supposed to be a contraction of *nicht auch*. It may be admitted that this account of its etymology can be roughly squared with the general meaning of *noch*, especially in its negative significance. Nevertheless, this explanation appears rather artificial. The positive and negative implications of *noch* seem to be so much of one piece that the derivation of this particle from two distinct sources appears very unlikely. Besides, there are many cases in which *noch* can hardly be said to embody the meaning of *und auch* or *nicht auch*. E. g., *Heute noch*. Or: *Noch nicht*. Furthermore, this explanation does no justice at all to the spontaneous and temperamental character of *noch*.

The etymology of *noch* as a variant of *nach* or a more primitive parent form for both seems indicated by the fact that the two particles

have basically the same meaning. Both introduce things as following *after*, *beyond*, *besides* other things. Like *auch*, *noch* appears in situations characterized by the meeting and concurrence of many objects. They have this in common that they relate separate things to each other, but they differ in that *auch* essentially denotes sameness whereas *noch* implies difference, otherness. In fact, *noch* must frequently be rendered in English with *another* or *else*, the latter of which derives from the old Teuton *elles* meaning *other* (cf. the previous note on *also*). Furthermore, *auch* signalizes the more passive reaction of perceiving existent situations, while *noch* voices a more active attitude and interest. This becomes very clear in sentences where *noch* is strengthened by *auch*. Here the reaction resulting in the use of *auch* is signalized as the basis of the more impulsive attitude expressed by *noch*. E. g., *Auch das noch!*, an exclamation which expresses complete loss and distress over an occurrence or situation which is felt as unpleasant as many others recently experienced (*auch*) but at the same time impresses the speaker as an additional, distinct inconvenience on top of the preceding ones (*noch*).

The native agreement and disagreement between *auch* and *noch* can perhaps be accounted for by the theory that both contain the root *ah* in its intensified form *ach*. As the vocal expression of the more passive reaction of perception, the original *ach* received a fuller and slower sound, viz., *auch*. Where the reaction was more active and even impulsive, the development was into a short explosive sound preceded by the letter *n* as the spontaneous expression of a straining and forward-pressure effort. The experience which gave birth to the words *noch* and *nach* is, then, characterized as the desire for and effort toward, or defensive action against, a thing *other than*, *beside*, *beyond*, *after*, what is presently obtaining. The logical function of *noch* is to assert or deny something which is seen as *other than* and *additional to*, a given situation. Its mood as an interjection is plain opposition to and contrasting additional desire for, something.

In expressions of assurance over against someone's fears to the contrary, *noch* stresses the certainty of the future reality despite present appearances.

Ich komme *noch*.

I am coming. *Don't worry.*

Morgen ist noch Zeit dazu.

There *will yet* be time for this tomorrow.

Noch stresses a present situation as being after and in addition to, a previous situation. Insofar as the two situations may be considered as a single continuous one the particle *immer* may be added.

Er liest *noch*.

He is still reading.

Er liest *immer noch*.

He has *not yet stopped* reading.

Er las *noch* um Mitternacht.
He was *still* reading at midnight.

Noch introduces objects, actions, situations, considerations and the like as additional, and urges them in a restrictive, prohibitive or encouraging sense, in spite of what seems indicated by the appearances of a situation.

Das muß heute *noch* sein.
This must be done *yet* today.

Noch ist Rettung möglich.
There is *still* a chance of rescue (escape).

Wollen Sie *noch* etwas Brot?
Do you want *some more* bread?

Ich habe *noch* etwas anderes.
I have *yet* something else.

Noch einmal.
Once *more*.

Das ist *noch* erlaubt.
This is *still within the limit* of what is permitted.
Or: *The time for which* this permission was granted has *not yet elapsed*.

Das ist *noch* möglich. Or: Das geht *noch*.
This is *yet just possible*. Or: This is *quite possible*.

In interested and anxious inquiry *noch* expresses the feeling that there must be something else beside what the speaker already knows.

Wie steht jetzt *noch* die Sache?
Now, let's see again how that is.

Wie machst du es *noch*?
How do you *ever* do it? Or: What is *the secret* of your method?

Wie war das *noch*?
Now, how was that? Do you remember?

Wie geht's denn *noch*?
How have you been *since I saw you last*.

In expressions of disapproval, indignation, etc., *noch* indicates that the thing in question is at variance with what is felt right and proper.

Auch das *noch*.
And now this too on top of all that has gone before.

The particle *doch* combines in a general way the functions of *denn*, *auch*, *noch*, *aber*. This does not mean that etymologically it is a contraction of these. Such an explanation would be too intellectualist and artificial an account for the powerful emotional force of *doch*. In no other particle or interjection does the emotional element so predominate as in *doch* whose logical function, while real and always present, is frequently almost submerged in the former. This agrees with our statement earlier in the paper that in direct proportion to the accumulation of particles their

logical function is obscured and may eventually be lost sight of. Etymologically, *doch* appears to be related to *aber*, *auch*, *noch* through *ah*, *ach* which, as we have seen, are expressions of surprised perception. There seems to be no etymological connection with *denn*, despite the fact that in some cases *doch* very plainly includes the logical implication of *denn*. The *d*-sound seems to be an original and integral part of *doch* as a genetic unit signaling a temperamental and on the whole unfavorable reaction to a perceived situation. The sharp *och* (cf. *noch*) preceded by the cutting *d* makes for a very effective sound-picture of aroused acrimony and vituperation. These sentiments are always present although often in a very mild degree and in a hypothetical sense. Again, *doch* is singular in that it asserts or urges actions whereas the other interjections are largely limited to statements however emotionally charged.

Doch urges arguments designed to cause an opponent to give up his view or position.

Es ist *doch* ganz klar, daß

It is quite clear that *Strange that some do not see this.*

Doch stresses a truth denied by others or one confirmed by new evidence in support of a suspicion.

Es ist also *doch* wahr

So it is true *after all*. . . .

Doch aggressively counters an opponent's view or wish.

Ich glaube, du hast es *doch* getan.

I *still* believe that you did it.

Ich tue es *doch*.

I do it *despite all that has been urged to the contrary*.

Doch strengthens impatient and angry replies to annoying and irritating requests.

Ich komme *doch*.

I am coming. *Stop bothering me.*

Was will er *doch* wieder?

What *in the world* does he *now* want again?

Doch strengthens impatient and angry pleas after all arguments have failed.

Lassen Sie das *doch* sein.

Please stop that *and don't be so bullheaded*.

Doch expresses surprise at another's view and actions.

Das Rad dreht sich *doch*!

Why, the wheel turns. *You said it did not*.

Was will er *doch*?

What does he *really* want?

Doch emphasizes questions marked by simultaneous hope and fear.

Sie haben den Brief *doch* aufgegeben?

I *hope* you have mailed the letter, *have you not*?

Sie haben *doch* nicht darauf vergessen?

I hope you have not forgotten about it, have you?

Doch is frequently used as an affirmative particle instead of *ja* in answer to questions of negative intention.

Sie sind nicht in der Stadt gewesen? *Doch*.

You have not been in town, have you? *Yes, I have.*

Sie sind es *doch* hoffentlich nicht gewesen? *Doch*.

I hope it has not been you. Yes, it was I.

As a provincialism in some sections of Southwestern Germany *doch* is used very freely instead of *ja*. While this is not correct it is possible because every question has at least the negative tinge of a doubt which is countered by *doch*. E. g., *Haben Sie das Buch gelesen? Doch.* Have you read the book? *Yes.*

The particle *schon* derives from a root which it has in common with *schön*. Basically, it expresses approval or absolute assurance arising from serene and calm acquaintance with the object involved. The formation of such a state of mind naturally requires some time and, by the same token, the object or situation concerned cannot be exclusively of the immediate presence but reaches back into the past. Thus *schon* has temporal connotations which, in fact, come to mind first whenever this particle occurs. Still this does not seem to be its original meaning. A similar genetic history seems to lie behind the English particle *already*. A thing that is *all ready* has some sort of history antedating the moment or time concerned. By its reference to an object's past, its beforeness, *schon* separates the object from other objects and confers on it the character of isolation, of being a case-by-itself, of being singular, unusual, surprising. This is true not only as regards time but as regards any variety of qualities and aspects.

Schon introduces past events which are of interest in the present. Where this present interest is lacking *schon* is omitted.

Mein Freund ist gekommen.

My friend has come. (Mere information)

Mein Freund ist *schon* gekommen.

My friend has already come. (Spoken to one knowing of or expecting the friend's coming.)

Schon stresses the unexpected or interesting in point of time.

Wir werden *schon* um acht Uhr gehen.

We shall leave at eight o'clock *already*.

Das war *schon* im ersten Jahrhundert so.

This was so *as early as* the first century.

Schon stresses the unexpected, unusual, striking in the qualitative side of things although the time factor is not quite absent.

Schon sein Aussehen verrät Furcht.

His *very* look betrays fear.

Schon die Kinder wissen das.

Even children know that. Or: *Even* the children know that.

Schon emphasizes the definite factual nature of statements even though the general situation may not be apt to bear them out.

Das muß ich *schon* sagen: er ist fleißig.

I *certainly* must say that he works hard.

Das muß ich *schon* zugeben.

Whatever else I may think, I must admit *at least* that.

Schon signalizes positions as definitely settled and beyond the point of argument, and strongly charged with the sentiment of disapproval.

Das gefällt mir *schon* gar nicht.

I don't like this at all. *This is definitely out.*

Das *schon* gar nicht.

Now, this *won't do* at all (*even though the alternatives are not acceptable either*).

Wenn *schon*, dann *schon*.

If it is done *at all*, let it be done *right*. Or: Either *the whole* or *nothing* at all. Or: If it *must be*, then *right now*.

Wenn man *schon* damit anfängt, dann . . .

If *that* argument is used, the matter might *as well be dropped*.

Or: If *such* means have to be used, the cause is *certainly lost*.

In expressions of approval, reassurance, encouragement, *schon* indicates that the object or argument is accepted as sufficient without the need of further consideration.

Das ist *schon* recht.

This will do. Or: This is *quite satisfactory*.

Schon recht. Or: *Schon* gut.

All right. Very well.

Das kann ich *schon* tun.

Certainly I can do that. Or: *Certainly* I do that *for you*.

Das geht *schon*.

Don't be afraid; this is not so difficult. Or: *Just make a little effort*.

Where there is a will . . .

Schon makes concessions with certain limitations and without admitting certain consequences.

Schon recht, aber . . .

All right, but still . . .

Er ist *schon* fleißig, aber planlos.

He works hard all right, but without a plan.

Das mag *schon* so sein, aber trotzdem ist meine Behauptung richtig.

This may *indeed* be so, and yet my assertion is correct.

Schon stresses the fact that something is different from what it might be expected to be.

Das muß *schon* so sein.

This has to be as it is. *It is not wrong and must not be changed.*

Or: This has to be as it is, *even though I don't know the reason for it.*

Schon emphasizes, in a facetious and sarcastic vein, opposing situations.

Weißt du das? Ich *schon*, aber du nicht.

Do you know this? *Yes, indeed*, I do, but you *certainly* don't.

Bei dir mag das *schon* so sein, aber nicht bei mir.

This may *well* be so with you, but not with me.

As mentioned earlier in this paper, the subject set forth herein is capable of a more thorough study than is presented here. The connection of the basic meaning of the interjections and their different uses in the context can be delineated in greater detail than is done here, although it may be assumed that the discerning reader will readily see their inner nexus. The mutually supplementary function of the interjections, briefly mentioned in this paper, can likewise be exposed at considerably greater length. Furthermore, there are other particles used as interjections, e. g., *also*, to mention only one. By way of suggestion, the German particle *also* is, like the English word of the same spelling, the result of a summarizing judgment, viz., al(l are) so, although their meanings differ widely. Still both meanings derive from a common root like two rivers arising from a common source yet flowing in different directions. The German *also* means *therefore*, *consequently*, *ergo*, stating the result of a comparison which is found in the conclusion of a syllogism. In many instances our minds, without adverting to the fact, go through a vague sort of syllogism, e. g., *Also ist es doch wahr, daß . . .* So it is true *after all*, as I suspected, that . . . *Also* here refers to the reasons which made the speaker suspect that such or such a thing might be true. These reasons are like the premises in a syllogism tending by their implications toward the truth of a suspected fact or situation. The use of *also* as a start of a conversation is of the same type.

After this short digression, we wish to say that the matter of etymology is left to the discriminating judgment of those in a scholarly manner acquainted with the problem of linguistic roots, but we add the plea that special attention be given to the *logic* of original human experience and spontaneous and untutored reactions. With these remarks the writer takes leave of the subject hoping that some day in the not too distant future he may have the pleasure of reading a more scholarly and readable study than he had the ability, time, and inclination to provide.



NEWS AND NOTES

Professor Adolphine Ernst

Am frühen Morgen, im Sommer wie im Winter, wenn die ersten Studenten sich erst langsam und mit verschlafenen Gesichtern in ihren Klassenzimmern einzufinden beginnen, konnte man – bis vor kurzem – eine kleine und rüstige Frauengestalt den „Hügel“ zur Universität hinaufschreiten sehen. Zuweilen hielt sie an, warf einen schnellen prüfenden Blick zum Himmel hinauf, dann eilte sie weiter und verschwand in der Seitentür von Bascom Hall. Sie winkte freundlich in das Büro dieses oder jenes Kollegen (wenn man schon da war), fragte, wie es gehe, und machte sich mit einem kurzen „So, jetzt geht's aber an die Arbeit“ für ihre Klassen bereit. Im Laufe der Jahre sind diese Klassen zu einem langen Zug von Studierenden der Naturwissenschaften geworden, die Fräulein Adolphine Ernst in die Schliche und Geheimnisse des „Scientific German“ eingeführt hat.

Als Fräulein Ernst im Sommer dieses Jahres in den Ruhestand trat, haben nicht nur die naturwissenschaftlichen Studenten ihren Abschied bedauert. Bedauert haben ihn auch Tausende von Lernbegierigen, die in der Korrespondenzabteilung der Universität von Fräulein Ernst durch die mannigfaltigsten Kurse in deutscher Sprache und Literatur geleitet worden sind. Wenn sich irgendwo Schule und Leben innig berühren, so war es in dieser Tätigkeit: Schulkinder und Hausfrauen, Menschen im Geschäftsleben und Patienten auf Krankenbetten, Studenten und neuerdings auch Soldaten, die sich weiter ausbilden wollten, erfuhren die wohlwollende und sichere Hand ihrer Lehre. So wurde sie, auf ihre Weise, zu einem Mittelpunkt wachsender Kreise, die zuletzt nicht nur ihren Heimatstaat Wisconsin, sondern auch ferne Gebiete des Landes umfaßten.

Als Kind der Stadt Watertown, wo ihr Vater, Dr. August Ernst, Präsident des Northwestern College war, hat sie sich stets mit dem Staate Wisconsin verbunden gefühlt. Auf der Universität in Madison erhielt sie ihre akademische Ausbildung, die sie 1912 mit der Erwerbung des Doktorgrades abschloß. Sie lehrte am Milwaukee Downer College in Milwaukee und an der Universität Kansas, bevor sie 1914 der Fakultät Wisconsin beitrat. Lebendig und anregend ist ihre Tätigkeit seitdem gewesen, als Lehrerin im Klassenzimmer wie als Ratgeberin der Jugend, als Leiterin des Deutschen Hauses der Universität wie als Begründerin neuer Kurse in der Korrespondenzabteilung.

Aber jedesmal, wenn sie die Grenzen des Staates verließ, um sich weiterem Studium zu widmen, – wie bei einem Aufenthalt an der Universität Leipzig oder an der Universität Chicago –, kehrte sie wieder an die Ufer der Seen von Wisconsin zurück, denen von jeher ihr Interesse und ihre Anhänglichkeit gegolten hat. Durch Kindheitseindrücke wie durch spätere Erlebnisse und Forschungen ist sie wie kein anderer berufen, in die Geschichte der Besiedlung Wisconsins einzudringen. Mehrere fesselnde Vorträge, die sie an der Tafelrunde der Deutschen Abteilung gehalten hat, haben sich inzwischen ausgeweitet zu einer umfassenden Ar-

beit über dieses Thema, das sie gegenwärtig mit Unterstützung der Carl Schurz Foundation ausarbeitet.

Seit dem Sommer dieses Jahres hat Fräulein Ernst ihren Wohnsitz wieder in Milwaukee aufgeschlagen, wohin so viele frühe Eindrücke sie zurückgerufen haben, und wo ihre Forschungen der Vollendung entgegen gehen. In der Deutschen Abteilung hat ihr Abschied eine große Lücke hinterlassen, wo ihre unermüdliche Energie und ihre warme und freundliche Teilnahme ihr einen bleibenden Platz verschafft haben. Man vermißt die wohlbekannte Persönlichkeit, die täglich frühmorgens, im Sommer wie im Winter, in treuem Pflichtbewußtsein den Hügel nach Bascom Hall hinaufschritt.

— P.

Professor Lilian L. Stroebe

After almost forty years of service Professor Lilian L. Stroebe, one of the foremost teachers of German in this country, has retired from the Vassar College Faculty.

Miss Stroebe was educated in her native Germany at the Karlsruhe State Teachers College and at the University of Heidelberg. In 1904 she was one of the very first women to receive the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from Heidelberg (under Johannes Hoops in English Philology), and when she came to this country the same year, she brought to the teaching of German her boundless enthusiasm and energy. After one year as teacher of German at Rye Seminary she joined the Vassar Department of German, serving as full professor since 1922 and, on the retirement of Professor Marian P. Whitney in 1929, succeeding her as chairman of the Department.

Miss Stroebe became a pioneer of teacher education in this country. With Marian P. Whitney she was the originator of Summer Schools of Languages in America, founding and financing the first German Summer School at Lakeville, Conn., in 1912. In 1915 she established the German School at Middlebury College (which was followed by the French and Spanish Schools in 1916 and 1917 respectively). Since this had folded up on account of the first world war, she again undauntedly opened a German Summer School at Mt. Holyoke and conducted it from 1927 to 1930.

Not only did many hundreds of Vassar graduates receive part of their education from Miss Stroebe, but a great number of teachers of German owe her their professional training, and indirectly countless other students and teachers are indebted to her.

Besides having written numerous articles on problems of education, on methods of teaching, and on similar subjects, Miss Stroebe is the author of over 25 grammars and texts, several of which were written in collaboration with Marian P. Whitney and others. Together with Professor Ruth Hofrichter, her colleague and successor as the head of the Vassar Department of German, Miss Stroebe edited Kaestner's *Emil und die Detektive* which for years has been the widest-read and best-known German text; when French and Spanish editions were modeled after it, it almost achieved the stature of an international classic. Miss Stroebe and Miss Whitney also were instrumental in bringing the famous Speck Collection of Goetheana to Yale University.

As an inspiring teacher, as an educator, administrator, and scholar Miss Stroebe has long since left her indelible mark on the teaching of German in America. However, as Miss Stroebe is freed of some of the burden and routine work at Vassar, her colleagues everywhere stand to profit by her increased leisure. A new book of hers is in the press, and doubtlessly Miss Stroebe has many more valuable contributions to make to the study and teaching of German.

— K.

Professor Hermann B. Almstedt

Wer jemals bei Versammlungen der amerikanischen Neusprachler oder auf der Universität von Missouri Hermann B. Almstedt gesehen oder mit ihm geplaudert, dem bleiben die scharfen Gesichtszüge, das hochgekämmte Haar und der elastische Gang stets in Erinnerung an eine Persönlichkeit, die man nicht vergessen kann.

Als um die Jahrhundertwende die Staatsuniversität von Missouri sich anschickte mehr als ein College des Mittelwestens zu sein, erkannte der damalige Präsident R. H. Jesse, daß der Grundstock jeder guten Hochschule eine hervorragende Fakultät sein muß, und besetzte die Lehrstühle mit den besten jungen Kräften, die er heranziehen konnte. Für die germanistische Abteilung wurde Hermann B. Almstedt gewählt, und von 1901 bis 1943 hat Almstedt seine Tätigkeit dort ausgeübt.

Der Neukömmeling war jedoch kein Fremdling in Missouri. Am 26. Dezember 1872 in St. Louis, Mo. geboren, besuchte Almstedt anfangs ein lutherisches Seminar, ging dann auf die Universität seines Heimatstaates und erwarb sich dort die akademischen Grade eines L. B. und eines Ph. B., und wurde zum Mitglied der Phi Beta Kappa Verbindung erwählt. Seine Studien setzte er in Chicago, Leipzig und Wolfenbüttel fort und erhielt 1900 sein Doktordiplom von der Universität von Chicago. Nach kurzem Lehramt in Chicago kam er nach Missouri zurück.

In der alten Schule der Präzision erzogen, bestand Almstedt auf eine mustergültige Beherrschung der zu lehrenden Sprachen, auf ein historisches Verstehen des Faches und auf ein genaues Erfassen aller Kausalität. Als Lehrer war Almstedt nur mit den besten Leistungen zufrieden und legte diesen Maßstab auch an seine eigene Person an. Ganz gleich ob er Sanskrit oder Gotisch oder ein Gedicht von Walther von der Vogelweide, Goethe oder Rilke erklärte, er wußte Leben und Schönheit in Sprache und Literatur zu entdecken und das alles seinen Studenten und Freunden mitzuteilen. Dem modernen Zug zum Spezialistentum im heutigen akademischen Beruf konnte Almstedt nie zustimmen. Erziehung war ihm Bildung des ganzen Menschen, nicht Trainieren einer Fähigkeit. Wie alle Germanisten seiner Generation hat Almstedt das Auf und Nieder seines Faches in zwei Weltkriegen miterlebt, doch sich nie von den Verhältnissen bezwingen lassen.

Neben seiner Lehrtätigkeit lag Almstedt das musikalische Leben in seinem Wohnort am Herzen. Er war ein erfahrener Organist und Klavierspieler und erfolgreicher Chordirigent.

Bei der Schlußfeier im Juni dieses Jahres wurde ihm von der Universität von Missouri der Titel "Professor Emeritus" verliehen, und hunderte von früheren Schülern schrieben ihrem ehemaligen Lehrer, als sie

hörten, daß er in den Ruhestand treten würde und wünschten ihm und seiner Gattin noch viele Jahre Freude am Leben, an ihren Kindern und ihren Großkindern.

Auf Almstedts Wirken paßt Leutholds Dichterwort:

Was vergangen, kehrt nicht wieder;
Sank es jedoch leuchtend nieder,
Leuchtet's lange noch zurück.

— B.

Das Deutsch meiner Heimatstadt

Wenn der Ostpreuße oder der Königsberger „ins Reich“ kommt, dann stellt er bald fest, daß ihm als „auch Deutschen“ eine ganze Anzahl der dort gebräuchlichsten Ausdrücke unbekannt oder doch nur wenig geläufig sind. Genau so geht es dem „aus dem Reich“, der zum ersten Male den Boden der Pregelstadt betritt.

„Trautstes Madamche“, lockt die Marktfrau. Die „Müllersche“ ist eine „Dicksche“, die „Schulzsche“ eine „Altsche“, aber die „Schneidersche“ ist eine „Plachandersche“. „Erbarmung“ ist ein besonders beliebter Ausdruck der Verwunderung. Und das „Annche“ ißt gern „Kuchchen“, die es aber nicht in ein „Tutchen“ packen läßt.

„Trinken trinkt er nich, aber rauchen raucht er.“ Wenn ein Kind sich verlaufen hat, wird es gefragt „Wems bist?“ oder auch „Wem seins bist?“ Aber wenn jemand sich ungeschickt anstellt, dann heißt es „Geh Filzschuh wichse!“ Eine Spezialität sind „Fleck“, und in der Wirtschaft bekommt man „E Schalche Fleck“. Wird jemand frech, „kriegt er eins für die Back“, oder noch drastischer „eins für die Freß“. Ist einer etwas größer, als man es sonst gewohnt ist, dann ist er ein „langes Gerebbel“, und das Gegenstück ist ein „Gnubbel“. Aber „Schmand mit Glumse“ mögen alle gern. Viele sind sogar ganz „jankrig“ danach.

Auf dem Ober- oder Schloßteich wird „Kahnche“ gefahren. Dabei kommt es vor, daß man sich „kabbelt“, aber es ist nicht notwendig, daß man sich dabei die „Kaldaunen vollärgert“. Auf die Frage wie es geht, hört man „immer koddrig und lustig“. Es kommt auch vor, daß die Zigarre nicht zieht, dann heißt es „die Kreet zieht nich“.

Sonntags an der See, ist man „molsch“. Abends im Hause werden die „Pampuschen“ angezogen, und in der Ecke „mieft“ der Hund. In der Woche gibt es „aasig viel zu tun“, aber das ist dem echten Königsberger „schnurz“.

Der Saal ist „proppevoll“. Draußen „pladdert“ es. „Der Marjell“ macht das „nüscht“, auch wenn es „stiemt“. Ihr gegenüber sitzt ein richtiger „Paschulke“, ein „schlaksiger Kerl“, der sieht aus wie ein „Singbeutel“.

Mancher Königsberger ärgert sich im Dienst „die Koddern voll“. Er „stiept“ seine Leute gehörig aus, weil sie „schoßlich“ sind und nicht „horchen“ können. Am Abend „huckt“ er sich an seinen Stammtisch, trinkt sein „Tulpche Grog“, „kraalt e bische“ mit seinen Freunden und geht dann schließlich heim in die „Bucht“.

— R. O. R.

BOOK REVIEWS

Studies in Honor of John Albrecht Walz.

Lancaster, Pa., 1941. viii, 335 pp.

The despair of a bibliographer, the annoyance of a specialist, the crux of a reviewer — in German they have a name for it, calling it a "Festschrift". No wonder, then, that in the present volume, dedicated by former graduate students of his to Professor John A. Walz on his seventieth birthday, some rather heterogeneous material has been brought together, ranging from pure linguistics to Biedermeier thought, from Americana Germanica to pure aesthetics. This very diversity, however, is apt to illumine how widely the influence of Dr. Walz has actually been felt in our circles, making both for sound and thorough scholarship and for a true devotion to the cultural cause and function of our discipline, an influence which we trust is not to be lost to the coming generation.

From among the fifteen papers thus collected, the reviewer must beg the privilege of singling out for brief comment whatever happens to fit his own patterns of interest, limiting himself, within the space allowed, to a mere recording of others.

H. W. Pfund, one of the three men who have initialed the volume, so to speak (F. O. Nolte and G. J. Metcalf are the other two, but nobody signs as the responsible editor), contributes a finished presentation of the life work of "George Henry Calvert, Admirer of Goethe" (pp. 117-161), placing the major emphasis on his writings on Germany and German literature. Packed with firsthand information, the article creates a clear picture of Calvert the critic and the translator, assigning to him a distinguished and striking position in the Goethe tradition of this country. It is refreshing and encouraging to see the labors of an older generation of American scholars bear a rich harvest in the author's use of secondary sources.—Some old battles that we see fought over again in this account, become even more distinct in outline as we read O. W. Long, who has synthesized many studies, not the least of them his own, to depict the

vogue problematically enjoyed by "Werther in America" (pp. 86-116) up to the days of Margaret Fuller. The article provides many well-chosen quotations and a comprehensive bibliography which will make it indispensable in any future discussion of the topic. — In an essay on "Niclas Müller, German-American Poet and Patriot" (pp. 1-20), P. A. Shelley breaks new ground, giving a sketch of the life and literary career of a Forty-Eighter and abolitionist (1809-75) whose verse, long since practically forgotten, found an early and cheering echo in translations and appraisals by C. T. Brooks, and who crossed the poetic paths even of William Cullen Bryant. Dr. Shelley is in a position to print from manuscript for the first time Brooks' translation of "Zehn gepanzerte Sonette", whose search for an author has thus at long last come to an end. With their strong antislavery sentiment, these sonnets identify another German active in his adopted country "among the foremost defenders of freedom and guarantors of justice". — The language spoken by the numerically strongest group of these Germans provides the subject of an article by A. F. Buffington, "English Loan Words in Pennsylvania German" (pp. 66-85), containing extensive and well-organized lists of such words with remarks on their pronunciation and inflections. Differing with other observers, he establishes percentages in some outstanding selections, including "Pumpernickle Bill", that are surprisingly low, ranging from 2½ per cent to about 5 per cent in counts of 10,000 words each.

Continuing the philological quest, G. J. Metcalf sheds new light on "Abstractions as Forms of Address in Fifteenth Century German" (pp. 242-255), discussing the origin of pluralized forms in addressing one person, such as "Gnaden", "Liebden", etc., and third person pronominal forms accompanying such abstractions. — W. P. von Schmertzling has made a close study of "Mittelhochdeutsche Jägerwörter vom Hund" (pp. 291-328), which is bound to clarify many hitherto obscure passages. — Into the inner reaches of modern linguistic research method we are taken by W. F. Twaddell in an article entitled "Functional Burden-

ing of Stressed Vowels in German" (pp. 199-208), as found in pairs or groups like *fliehen* – *flehen*, *biete* – *Beete*, etc., while Archer Taylor submits an investigation of the origin and spread of the curious medieval formula "Zwischen Pfingsten und Strassburg" (pp. 21-30) signifying "never" or "nowhere". – R-M. S. Heffner has collected some "Notes on Walther's Use of *können* and *mögen*" (pp. 49-65) presenting data on the shift of meaning in these verbs that took place in the MHG centuries. A reinterpretation of many passages involving fine distinctions is implied.

We have thus returned to researches of a more literary nature, among which two studies dealing with Goethe claim our first attention. Walter Silz reexamines "Goethe's Poem 'Auf dem See'" (pp. 41-48) to refute Barker Fairley's interpretation of the first octet, showing that "hin-auf" can, simply enough, mean only "to the end of the lake". Like Fairley, however, he observes a contrast in the nature-mindedness of the first and last octets, a contrast between "immature and mature" as he calls it, subjective and objective, personal and impersonal, as one might say as well. – An ambitious undertaking is that of T. K. Brown, who proposes to regard even "Goethe's *Lila* as a Fragment of the Great Confession" (pp. 209-220). To prove his point, he has to fall back upon the lost version of 1777, which he reconstructs in the usual manner, but recognizing in the Baron and his wife Goethe and Frau von Stein, without setting the conventional and ultimate reference to the Duke and Duchess aside. The result is an esoteric meaning paralleling the one obvious to us. The presentation of the genesis of the play is accordingly focused upon the tension prevailing about the turn of the year (1776-77) between the poet and the loved woman, "Stern-thal" – among quite a number of identifications by name – being penetrated as a thin disguise of Goethe himself. *Es klappt alles wunderbar*, but the author has hardly used all the material that might go into such an accounting, contenting himself with stating his case.

"A Note on Kleist and Kant" (pp. 31-40), by I. S. Stamm, returns to an oft-discussed problem. Minimizing, especially over against G. Fricke whom he is not the first to attack in this regard, the importance of the "Zusammenbruch über Kant" of March 1801, the author points out

in several instances, notably à propos the *Lebensplan* of 1800, Kleist's unquenched metaphysical longing even before that date, substantiating, as it were, Unger's view of the matter expressed in 1922. The argument (the author is oriented on Gundolf) is given more body by an interpretation seeing in Kleist's dilemma a repetition of a typical experience of the Enlightenment, which he states "may be taken as a symbol of the spiritual death of eighteenth-century dogmatic rationalism". – The nineteenth century is represented by a study which, abandoning coastal navigation, boldly sails out upon the vast expanse of ultimate meanings, and achieves, so it appears to the reviewer, a happy landing. This is Alan Holske's stimulating discussion of "Stifter and the Biedermeier Crisis" (pp. 256-290). In it the author sets forth the pivotal significance of the failure of the Biedermeier generation, exemplified by Stifter, to reintegrate those cultural and social-economic forces in the life of the nation which had become more and more divergent since ca. 1770. It is of course a question whether this problem could have been solved at all, for as the author himself is at pains to point out by way of contrast, even the contemporary Young Germans, who saw the problem plainly enough, proposed only a mechanical solution. At any rate, Holske's view of Stifter's position differs basically from the one now more or less widely accepted of which Wolfgang Paulsen's contribution to another *Festschrift* of the same year (in honor of S. Singer, *Corona*, pp. 228-251) is perhaps the most refined and convincing expression. To study the two articles – two approaches – side by side, is to obtain a glimpse of the pluralistic nature of the science of literature. – Only brief mention, for lack of competence, can be accorded to C. F. Barnason's critical presentation of "Early Danish and Swedish Writers on Native History" (pp. 162-198). Beginning with the editio princeps of Saxo Grammaticus (Paris, 1514), the author marshals a long series of historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, setting forth, mainly as a phase of second-hand humanism, their sometimes curious ambitions and the underlying causes of their obvious defects and shortcomings.

F. O. Nolte pursues his researches in the relation of "Art and Reality" (pp. 221-241) in a spirited chapter, here slightly condensed, from his book of the same

title which he has since published (Lancaster, Pa., 1942). One need not agree with every thesis of his earlier book on Lessing's *Laokoon* to find the present discussion clarifying and satisfying. Old familiar topics such as the difference between reality and actuality, the basic problem in the fight over the three dramatic "unities", the adherence of tragedy to history, are illumined by a sagacious disquisition that gets along with a minimum of technical terms. The author's final plea to regard art as "a much more fragile vessel than [it] is commonly supposed to be", should be heeded even in seminars.

The volume concludes with a list of the publications (1896-1941, pp. 329-335) of Professor Walz compiled by P. A. Shelley, which enables the reader to gauge the close thematic relationship between the work of the honored teacher and the studies here assembled. The book is beautifully printed in pica type and handsomely bound in dark red cloth. Very few misprints have been observed. What makes the book distinctive is the lightness of touch, the urbanity of expression which is characteristic of practically every page of it no matter how heavily laden with the substance of learning. More than that, this sheaf of studies may well be placed in the hands of any graduate beginning his special studies in the Germanics so as to give him a conception of some of the manifold directions in which he may develop his life interest, for it is representative of American *Germanistik*.

—H. W. Nordmeyer

University of Michigan.

An Index to the Poems of Rainer Maria Rilke-Gesammelte Werke und Späte Gedichte.

Compiled by Herman Salinger. The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin, 1942, 32 pp. \$1.00.

Rilke's Bild hebt sich immer klarer und bedeutsamer von dem weiten und verwirrenden Rundbild der deutschen Dichtung ab. Seine formale, philosophisch-religiöse und kulturelle Eigenart lassen ihn über Dehmel und George hinaus als den großen neueren Lyriker deutscher Zunge erscheinen, dessen edelgeformte tiefmusikalischen Strophen in eine gottverlassene, schönheitsbare und erschütternde Gegenwart hineintönen. Mehr als jeder andere deutsche Dichter hat Rilke im letzten Jahrzehnt die Aufmerksamkeit des Auslandes auf sich gezogen und kritische Beachtung gefunden.

Für den Liebhaber wie für den Forscher erscheint deshalb Herman Salinger's sorgfältig angelegter Index zu Rilke's Gedichten zeitgemäß. Der Verfasser legt seiner Liste Rilkes Gesammelte Werke und die Späten Gedichte zugrunde und bietet neben den Anfangszeilen auch wo ein Titel jeweils erscheint, die Titel der Gedichte in alphabetischer Anordnung. Der Hauptliste folgen die Eingänge der in den ausgewählten Gedichten erscheinenden Stücke und schließlich Titelvarianten soweit sie sich in den Ausgewählten Gedichten finden.

Der Index ist zwar, wie der Verfasser morgensternisch bemerkt, „ein Knie sonst nichts“, doch ist er als Nachweisquelle durchaus brauchbar und deutet zugleich die Fülle und Vielseitigkeit der Rilkeschen Lyrik an.

—Erich Funke

University of Iowa.

